Marxism and the Bolshevik State

George Spiro

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF
CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MARXISM AND THE BOLSHEVIK STATE

Workers Democratic World Government

VERSUS

National-Burocratic 'Soviet' and Capitalist Regimes

By GEORGE SPIRO

RED STAR PRESS
COOPER STATION, NEW YORK CITY

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Copyright by the author

Passages from this book may be reproduced without permission
from the publisher. It is reasonably proper to
indicate the source of the passages cited.

Published Autumn 1951

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

JN6511
S6

CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

The Emergence of Stalin's Power and the Trotsky Opposition

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	The Subject and the Method of Analysis and Presentation	9
II.	Lenin's Break with Stalin	17
III.	The First Stalinist Congress of the Bolshevik Party	26
IV.	The Trio Breaks with Trotsky	38
V.	The Thirteenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party	53
VI.	The 1923 Betrayal of the Proletariat	65
VII.	The Fifth Congress of the Comintern	76
VIII.	Trotsky's Overture to Stalin	78
IX.	Trotsky Relinquishes His War Post	82
X.	Trotsky Seeking a "Political Vacation"	86
XI.	Trotsky Stamps Out a Spark of Anti-Stalin Exposure	88
XII.	Stalin Breaks with Zinoviev and Kamenev	94
XIII.	The Stalin-Trotsky Betrayal of the British Workers	102
XIV.	The Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc	107
XV.	Trotsky's Theory of Permanent Revolution	118
XVI.	Trotsky Sells His Permanent Revolution	126
XVII.	The Stalin-Trotsky Betrayal of the Chinese Revolution	130
XVIII.	Trotsky's Sham Fight on Policy in China	140
XIX.	Stalin Extirpates the Opposition	149
XX.	Trotsky's Part in the Murder of Rykov	157

M731267

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER PAGE

XXI. The Core of Trotsky's International Movement 163

XXII. Stalin, Trotsky and the Rise of Hitler 175

XXIII. Trotsky's Line for an "Independent" International 188

XXIV. The Stifling of the French Proletariat 192

XXV. Trotsky's French Turn in America 196

XXVI. The Betrayal of the Proletarian Revolution in Spain; Stalinist Leftist Line—1931-1934 198

XXVII. Spain: Stalinist Rightist Line—1934-1939 205

XXVIII. Trotsky's End 250

VOLUME TWO

Lenin's Burocratism and Russian Nationalism

I. Burocratism in the First Stage of the Bolshevik Revolution 259

II. The Official Break with the Pre-October Avowals on the Paris Commune 275

III. Lenin's Brest-Litovsk Policy 284

IV. Lenin Disrupts the Potential World Revolutionary Army and Navy 311

V. Lenin Adopts Trotsky's Brest Scheme Against the Masses 326

VI. The Brest Scrap of Paper 349

VII. The Direct Betrayal of the Finnish, Esthonian, Latvian and Ukrainian Masses 357

VIII. The Consequences of Lenin's Mythical Peace . . . 376

IX. Consolidating the National-Burocratic Power . . 405

X. The Eighth Congress of the Bolshevik Party . . . 408

XI. The Army of the Sovnarkom 417

XII. The Cancer of Careerism in the Sovnarkom Army 437

XIII. The Ninth Congress of the R.C.P.—An Anti-Lenin Revolt 460

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER PAGE

XIV. The Forerunner of the Anglo-Russian Committee 465

XV. The Policy of Creating Puppet Regimes 470

XVI. Evading the Problem of Burocratism 473

XVII. Trotsky's Sortie Against Lenin 477

XVIII. The Anti-Lenin Workers Opposition in the Bolshevik Party 482

XIX. The Kronstadt Rebellion 499

XX. The Destruction of the Workers Opposition . . . 505

XXI. Lenin's Great-Russian Foreign Policy 513

XXII. The Communist International Under Lenin a Tool of the Russian Burocracy 526

XXIII. Stalin in Power and Lenin's Futile Awakening . . 540

XXIV. Trotsky's Hint at Assassination of Lenin 548

XXV. Two Basic Reactionary Traits in Bolshevism . . . 554

VOLUME THREE

Marx's and Engels's Burocratism and German Nationalism

I. The Nationalist-Burocratic Second International 561

II. Burocratism and Early Politics of the First International 566

III. Marx's Left-Bourgeois German Nationalist Policy in the Revolution of 1848 585

IV. Some Aspects of the Private Political Ideology of Marx and Engels 612

V. Marx's Personal and Political Insincerity 628

VI. Marx's German-Nationalist Policy in the Franco-Prussian War 637

VII. Marx and Engels Betray the Proletariat During the Paris Commune 641

VIII. Marx's Dread of a French Workers State and the Irony of History 671

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER PAGE

VOLUME FOUR

Anti-Semitism and Left Christianism in the Marxist System

I. The Plekhanov-Lenin Betrayal of the 1905 Revolution on Anti-Semitic Grounds 681

II. A Marxist-Ignored Phenomenon in the Ancient and Medieval Class Struggles—The Jewish Scapegoat 705

III. Marx Concealed from the Proletariat a Vital Political Institution Under Capitalism 723

IV. Marx's and Engels's Anti-Semitism 742

V. Marx and Engels Incite to Anti-Jewish Pogroms in Posen 755

VI. Marx's Support to the Anti-Semitic Cry of "Jewish High Finance" 770

VII. Marxism and Bakuninism Aid the Tsar in the Pogroms of 1881 780

VIII. Anti-Semitism within the European Pre-1914 Marxist Movement 784

IX. The Lenin-Caused "Brest" Pogroms 801

X. Stalin Hounding the Jews in the U.S.S.R. 814

XI. An Effect of Marxist Politics: The Murder of Six Million Members of the Jewish Scapegoat . . . 833

XII. Marxism Diverts the Workers from Studying Anti-Semitism in America 854

XIII. Marxist Anti-Semitism in the United States . . . 894

XIV. Marx Upholding Negro Slavery: The Political Distinction Between Negro and Jew 903

XV. The Jewish Bourgeoisie, Jewish Theology and Bourgeois Atheists Promoting Anti-Semitism 916

XVI. Marxism's Hand in Creating the Reactionary Zionist State 932

XVII. The Mythical Crucifixion of the Legendary Jesus—The Central Feature in Christian Anti-Semitism 947

XVIII. The Marxist System Applying Left Christianism . . 969

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER PAGE

XIX. The Bolshevik State Employing Left Christianism and Christian Anti-Semitism 972

XX. Development of Marxist Neo-Christianity by the Bolshevik State 988

XXI The Bolshevik State Sustains the Symbol of Crucifixion, Adopts the Christian Anti-Semitic Calendar 1000

XXII. Marxism—The Last Bulwark of Anti-Semitism and Christianity 1029

VOLUME FIVE

A Higher Stage of Mankind's Evolution: The Democratic Workers World State

I. The Secret of Marxism's Immense Victory 1043

II. The Class Nature of the Bolshevik State 1051

III. Democratic Workers World State—Transition to the Classless Non-National Society 1072

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I.

THE SUBJECT AND THE METHOD OF ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION

1. *Scientific History and Unscientific Historians*

THIS WORK is a study of a political movement known as Marxism, after its founder Karl Marx (1818-1883), and of a State which had its origin in the Bolshevik Revolution (November 7, 1917) and goes under the name of Union of Socialist Soviet Republics.

An investigator undertaking a study of a political movement or the history of an event in the life of mankind is compelled to consult reference books, annalists, narrators and analysts and frequently has to rely on their interpretations of causes which propel the forces that make history. But how is one to determine the reliability of a chronicler and the creditability of the records? We cannot escape the conclusion that men are biased in matters involving classes, groups and personalities and give expression to their bias in making or writing history. Can, for example, supporters of the Russian bourgeoisie and the landed nobility view the Bolshevik State in the same light as a supporter of this State? History is a highly controversial subject, and every researcher approaches the wells of information with partiality which causes the selection of material aptly associated with a particular ideology. Mutually antagonistic schools of historians will slant the recording of events in favor of their respective political and social outlooks. The ideologists of the Confederate States of America treated the issue of Negro slavery from the aspect of the class which thrived on that slavery, not from the angle of the oppressed Negro. A Catholic Church historian will impart an altogether different color to the Spanish Inquisition than a historian sympathizing with its Jewish victims, though technically both may be equally competent specialists on this historical occurrence.

We are confronted, therefore, with this question: can we, in our undertaking, rely on bourgeois historians whose thinking mirrors the viewpoint and aspirations of the bourgeoisie and who are declared or undeclared partisans of the classes that were overthrown by the Bolshevik Revolution? True, most bourgeois historians claim complete objectivity and impartiality. A few, however, make at least an attempt at frankness in conceding the impossibility of an impartial execution of a historical work. Thus:

"The study of human societies is not only of an almost inconceivable diversity and multiplication of aspects but is of such a nature that no man, however balanced he may be, however determined to maintain himself on the line of strict impartiality, can ever escape from the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

thousand biases created in him by the many particular acquired or inherited traits of his personal nature." (*Encyclopedia of Social Sciences,* VII, 367)

The fundamental bias of the bourgeois historian is not of a personal but of a political nature. Vaguely handicapped or consciously impelled by a deep-rooted consideration for the interests of Capitalism, the bourgeois historian distorts history and not infrequently inserts into the calendar of events invented "facts," as, for example, the reports in the early period of the Bolshevik State that it had introduced the nationalization of women. The bourgeois historian has made thousands of false charges against Marxism. Logically, therefore, we must regard the records of the historians of the bourgeoisie with utmost mistrust and choose our material from their works only with the greatest of care. As to their "opinion" of Marxism and of the Bolshevik State, it must be rejected because at bottom it is biased in favor of Capitalism.

Since the Bolshevik State represents the axis of our study, we shall center our attention on the historians issuing from this State. Here we find a development of two schools, the first representing the governing Bolshevik Party headed by Joseph Stalin, the other, relatively limited in scope, operating outside the Bolshevik State, connected with the name of Leon Trotsky. For more than a decade, Trotsky was a high figure in the Bolshevik Party and was exiled abroad in 1929. Trotsky never ceased professing his adherence to Bolshevism. In the course of this study both of these political tendencies and their historians are subjected to a detailed inspection and analysis; in this introductory chapter we shall put both to a very brief test.

As we approach the documentary stores of the Bolshevik State we come upon the name of M. N. Pokrovsky, apparently a historian of great Marxist erudition. We give the story of Pokrovsky as an illustration of the material and of the method largely used in this work. Official Bolshevik publications assert:

"M. N. Pokrovsky . . . author of brilliant Marxist works on Russian history." (*Pedagogicheskaya Encyclopedia,* I, 470, Moscow, 1927). "Pokrovsky, M. N. (Domov) (b. 1868)—a great Russian scholar, historic-Marxist, Bolshevik . . . his basic work *Russian History from Remote Times* which for the first time presented a consistent Marxist illumination on the entire process of Russian history . . . Was the initiator and organizer of a whole number of the most important scientific institutions of the Republic." ("Supplements" to Lenin's *Works,* XVII, 790. State Publishing, Moscow-Leningrad, 1929)

In April 1932 Pokrovsky died. The immediate reaction of the Stalin leadership was made public: "The Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) with profound sorrow announces the death of a most prominent representative of the old Bolshevik guard . . . world famous scholar-Communist, most eminent organizer and director of our theoretical front." (*Pravda,* April 12, 1932)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

All the institutions of the State and of the Bolshevik Party paid the highest tribute to Pokrovsky:

"In the person of Comrade Pokrovsky the Party developed an example of a scientist who combined scientific work of world significance with a militant struggle for purity of Marxist-Leninist ideas." (Collegium of the Peoples Commissariat of Education of the RSFSR, *Pravda,* April 13, 1932.)

"The Council of Peoples Commissars of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics with profound sorrow announces the death of Michael Nikolaevich Pokrovsky, Bolshevik organizer of the highest education of the Soviet Union, guide of the scientific Communist forces, warrior for the Marxist-Leninist theory, who gave his talent, his life to the cause of the struggle of the working class, the cause of victory of Socialism." *(Izvestia,* April 12, 1932)

It would appear from these eulogies that Pokrovsky was established as the brightest star in the firmament of Bolshevik State historians and scholars.

When we check on Pokrovsky in the Bolshevik publications of a later date we find an amazing change. *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia,* for example, presents the following condemnatory evaluation of Pokrovsky:

"However, having failed to absorb the basic fundamentals of Marxism—dialectic and historical materialism—Pokrovsky succumbed to the influence of economic materialism and Makhism of the Bogdanovist variety which he identified with Marxism. As a result, under the influence of this eclectic philosophical mixture, Pokrovsky committed the most profound errors and created his own concept of historical science and the historical process which, at the root, is at variance with and is hostile to Marxism. . . . These anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist concepts of the Pokrovsky school and the liquidatory views upon historical science have brought a great lag in the historical front in the U.S.S.R." (XXX, 26, 27)

In an official Bolshevik Party journal we read: "Schematism, as is well known, was that heavy baggage which prevented M. N. Pokrovsky from creating a textbook on history indispensable to the proletariat. Schematism, not accidentally, led Pokrovsky to a whole series of anti-Leninist views in historical science, as well as to a concept of the role of 'mercantile capital' in Russia, a concept alien to Marxism and Leninism, a distortion of the class character of absolutism. The overcoming of the mistakes and lifeless schematism of M. N. Pokrovsky, still hovering over many of our historians, constitutes the first task on our historical front." *(Bolshevik,* Feb. 1, 1936, 4)

Yet when Pokrovsky died, the same journal had made the following positive statement about him:

"In his works the task of making the treasures of Marxist-Leninist analysis of the historical process a mighty weapon in the hands of the proletariat, in the hands of the proletarian Party, has always been in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the forefront . . . Thousands and thousands of Communists, proletarians heard his reports and lectures saturated with the teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin." *(Bolshevik,* April 15, 1932, 2-3)

We have seen that the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party guided by Stalin, and the Council of Peoples Commissars, also guided by Stalin, paid an extremely high tribute to Pokrovsky's allegedly scientific treatment of history. Now these very institutions, guided by the same Stalin, spoke of the very same Pokrovsky school with sharp disapproval:

"The Central Committee (Bolsheviks) and the Council of Peoples Commissars of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics emphasize that the injurious tendencies and attempts to liquidate history as a science are linked in the first place with the dissemination of erroneous views among certain of our historians which are native to the so-called 'historical school of Pokrovsky.' " *(Bolshevik,* Feb. 1, 1936)

Prior to and at the time of his death it appeared as though Pokrovsky had laid a secure, scientific foundation for the entire educational system of the Bolshevik State, particularly in the field of the study of history. During the twelve-year period of his labors as the most respected educator in the Bolshevik State, the Bolshevik school textbooks and pedagogic instruction were impregnated with the "Pokrovsky" views which, it would seem from the official statements by the Stalin leadership, were to endure indefinitely. However, only a little more than two years following his death, this leadership took a drastic decision regarding the textbooks and instruction, as recorded by the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia:*

"In its decision of May 16, 1934, the Soviet of Peoples Commissars of the U.S.S.R. and the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) arrived at the conclusion that 'the instruction on history in the schools of USSR is unsatisfactory. The textbooks and the instruction itself have an abstract, schematic character. Instead of expounding civil history in a lively entertaining form with the presentation of the most important events and facts in their chronological order with the characteristic of historians, the students are served with abstract sociological schemes for a coherent presentation of social theory.' " (XXX, 27)

It appears, therefore, that we can hardly rely on the interpretation of history as presented by the textbooks of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics prior to the 1934 decision by the Stalin leadership. New textbooks were devised, and these, one would assume, treated history in a truly scientific fashion. But no, these too were found to be tainted with Pokrovsky's views:

"The Sovnarkom and the Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party (B) created special groups for composing new, model textbooks on history. Comrades Stalin, Zhdanov and Kirov personally examined the summary of the textbooks, and rendered an exhaustive and harsh criticism of them, especially the textbook on the history of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the peoples of the USSR, and gave concrete directives along what line they should be reconstructed. Yet, in its decision of January 26, 1936 the Sovnarkom and the Central Committee of the All Russian C. P. (B) was compelled to establish that the history textbooks submitted for inspection continued to suffer from the same shortcomings (especially unsatisfactory again was the textbook on the history of the peoples of the USSR). The Sovnarkom and CC of the All-Russian C. P. (B) pointed out that these false views are connected, in the first place, with the historical schematism of Pokrovsky prevailing among certain Soviet historians, especially historians of the peoples of the USSR, schematism long ago condemned by the Party." *(Great Sov. Enc.* XXX, 27)

Now for an example from the school of history founded by Leon Trotsky. In his autobiography Trotsky makes a number of references to Lenin's Will: "Stalin in his archives might come upon Lenin's will." *(My Life,* Rus. Ed. II, 205). "It was at this time that in his mind was taking shape that document which eventually became known under the name of the 'Will.' " (215). "Only in this connection the meaning of the so-called 'Will' becomes entirely clear." (278)

In a book called *The Stalin School of Falsification* Trotsky on page 74 says: "In the essence of the matter that plan of Lenin was wholly directed against Stalin. It flowed from the same train of thought which found its expression in the so-called 'Testament.' "

However, in a different document Trotsky wrote: "Comrade Lenin has not left any 'Will.' " *(International Press Correspondence,* Sept. 3, 1925, 1005)

From the minor test to which we have subjected the Stalin and the Trotsky schools, it is obvious that we must approach both with caution.

Are the historians of the Bolshevik State scientific? The answer to this question, as well as to numerous other connected with Marxism and the Bolshevik State, are presented in the main body of our investigation. At this point we pose this question: How to explain the discrepancies in the statements of the historians of various schools of the bourgeoisie and of the Bolshevik State? Trotsky, in the Introduction to his work *Stalin* says: "Our epoch is above all an epoch of lies." This is not correct. The epoch of the bourgeoisie and of the Bolshevik State, as were all the previous epochs, is primarily an epoch of either premeditated or unintentional mixing of fiction with facts in history-writing.

2. *The Method*

This investigator's former books could be accurately listed as unintentional varieties of the Stalin and the Trotsky schools. What method must we pursue, then, to prevent this present study from falling into some category of fiction-fact history? How to avoid the hazard of treating facts as fiction and fiction as facts? The problem entails im-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

measurable difficulties, and we can think of no other means of solving it than by doubting all previously established schools, by feeling our way through ascertainable facts and by pressing toward conclusions whether they meet with the approval or disapproval of people nurtured on the disorienting and confusing fiction-fact records and interpretations of history.

Because of the extraordinary, seemingly incredible facts uncovered by this investigation, and because, in complete accord with these singular facts, most startling conclusions are drawn, this investigator has been impelled to depart from the customary rules and forms of presentation. Instead of presenting a ready-made opinion supported by trite citations, we present, for the most part, hitherto unused material and leave the recital of the subject to the documentation. On the basis of this documentation we offer our commentaries and crystallize our political deductions. For this work, before all else, is a political exposure. Documentation, not text, performs the function of revealing or concealing facts; and it is the documentation in this work that lays bare the fundamental nature of the Stalin and the Trotsky schools, brings to light the inner essence of Marxism, and also of Anarchism, and affords a close view of the policies of the bourgeoisie. As limited examples of the method employed throughout the major part of this investigation we cite the above-given cases of Pokrovsky and Lenin's "Will."

In our endeavor to break down the fiction-fact compounds of the unscientific historians we have discovered that the clues to true history often reside in the so-called incidental features accompanying a historical event, in fragments of seemingly unimportant conversations, in an insignificant-looking phrase parenthetically occurring in an official report or order. In the body of the work for example, we cite a parenthetical remark by Lenin which, to our knowledge, has never been used as source material, and which is of greater value to an investigator of the true history of the Bolshevik State than a shelf of histories produced either by the bourgeoisie or by any historians of that State.

In brief, the exploration must proceed not along the path artificially cut by the fiction-fact historians as the highway of history but in the "byways" which they have hidden with a plethora of irrelevancies. These "byways" with their "incidental" features represent the true road history is traversing. Prior to this investigation, as we have indicated, we travelled the path followed by the unscientific historians, accepted many things on their say-so, and arrived pretty much at the same false destination, a manufactured, not a real, view of the Bolshevik State and of Marxism.

The key resided in the rescuing of the documentary evidence, overlooked, or reduced or deliberately omitted by these historians. As a fortunate feature, this investigator is familiar with the Russian language. Without it no scientific investigation of the Bolshevik State would have been possible.

The major portion of the material, which is indispensable if a

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

correct understanding of the Bolshevik State is to be obtained, has never before been translated into any language, has never been presented, even scantily, in the textbooks of the Bolshevik State or in the bourgeois textbooks; it stayed buried in the archives, widely scattered throughout numerous Marxist publications. The overall picture the assembled evidence produces may appear utterly fantastic to an eye accustomed to view the distorted images of Marxism and the Bolshevik State as truth.

The average reader has been trained by historians to expect a work on history to unfold in a "normal" chronological order. However, a strictly chronological treatment of highly controversial occurrences in society can prevent the enlightenment which could be achieved, through a logical exposition, at the expense of chronology. Therefore because our newly-formed concept of Marxism and of the Bolshevik State unfolds in a diametrically opposite direction from all previous appraisals, interpretations and representations, it has been necessary, in order to avoid a reader's possible mental block, to depart from the common form of presentation. In this work we shall not trace history chronologically but will work as an explorer searches for the source of a river, starting at the mouth and tracing it to the headwaters. We start with recent events and they will lead us to the past.

Broadly speaking, to a mature political student it is *logic* that is the decisive element, not a catalogue of events following each other like letters in an alphabet. And this study is addressed, in the first place, to the *mature political student,* not to the average reader or curiosity-seeker.

3. *A Bird's-Eye View of the Investigation*

The work has taken nearly 14 years of continual labors; it is a result of a distinct line of study, research and ideological development. It has been subdivided into five parts.

Part One begins at the close of the first, or the Lenin period, of the Bolshevik State, and the commencement of the Stalin era. At this juncture the relations among the leaders of the Bolshevik Party undergo examination. While we reject the fetishism of the personal factor in history, we do not hold to the extreme view which tends to disregard this factor. Every individual in society, worker or capitalist, farmer or professional, plays a part in the history of society. And some often play a decisive role. The inquiry into the relations among the Bolsheviks goes deeper than any previously recorded examination; however some essential aspects of these relations are also discussed much later in the study. Meanwhile the mechanics of the transition from the Lenin to the Stalin stage are given special attention and Trotsky's actual role during this transition is unveiled. Finally, varied facets of the concrete policy of the Moscow, or the Communist International, during the Stalin regime, and how this policy affected Germany, China, Spain and other countries, undergo a critical inspection.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Part Two deals with the Lenin period of the Bolshevik State (1917-1922). The conventional notions about Lenin which have been rooted in all spheres of political thought are seen to be delusions and fiction. Out of the documentary evidence, extracted for the first time from the Bolshevik archives, emerges the true Lenin. Among the most astounding discoveries are: the motives behind Lenin's Brest-Litovsk policy and the formation of the Red Army; the generally unknown story of the Workers Opposition in the Bolshevik Party; Lenin's actual policy on the issue of burocratism; the inner mainspring of Lenin's foreign policy; the purpose behind the building of the Communist International. Certain aspects of the relations between Lenin and Stalin, unexplained in Part One, become clear, and the long-disputed point raised in anti-Stalin circles, whether Stalin is a true follower of Lenin, is cleared up to a large measure.

In Part Three the origin and evolution of Marxism are traced along channels which run counter to all the universal, totally false and outworn explanations and impressions of what Marxism is. The highlights are: Marx's policies in the First International; the goal he and his collaborators pursued in the Revolution of 1848; their positions in various wars; their actual policy toward the Paris Commune of 1871. This last point is of especial significance. The evidence not only upsets all prevailing views regarding Marx's reaction to the events in France, particularly in Paris, but unveils the true political goal of Marx and Engels and, by extension, of his followers. Only in the light of the material collected in this Part and in the two Parts following can the true nature and policies of the Bolshevik State be understood.

Part Four is unique in that it deals with a subject which, at first glance, may seem to the political student of either the Marxist or bourgeois schools as not germain to the fundamental theme of the study. The subject is anti-Semitism. Diligent research establishes that it is a question of enormous importance, especially in the last half century, and that this question is closely bound up with Marxism and the Bolshevik State; it is a factor of first magnitude in modern politics. The investigation establishes that neither the bourgeois nor the Marxist scholars have ever produced a comprehensive scientific work on the origin, evolution, function and political weight of anti-Semitism. Special research had to be conducted ranging from the examination of Ancient and Middle Ages documents to an exhaustive inspection of most of the eminent bourgeois and Marxist writers. In this case, too, it was the "incidental" and "irrelevant" facts that brought into focus the essence of anti-Semitism and the relation of the Marxists, the Liberals, the Anarchists and other elements to it. The most outstanding discoveries appearing in this Part are: the nature and basic function of anti-Semitism; the forces that perpetuate anti-Semitism; Marx's and Engels' policies in the Jewish pogroms of 1848 and 1881; the policy of the Marxists in relation to the pogroms in the 1905 Revolution in Russia and the true reason for the collapse of that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Revolution; the role of Marxism and of other tendencies during the Nazi extermination of Jews; the chief culprits whose policies have caused continual massacres of Jews since 1848; the solution of the problem of anti-Semitisim. As one of the related subjects, the connection of Zionism, the Church and the Synagogue with the question of anti-Semitism is investigated for the purpose of establishing the attitude of Marxism towards Zionism, Christianity and Judaism. Light is shed on the difference between the case of the Negro and that of the Jew. Because the research on anti-Semitism had to span more than 2,000 years and cover much trackless historical ground, a considerable space has been alloted to the material bearing on this age-long social-political phenomenon.

Part Five represents chiefly a summary of the investigation, the final verdict brought in by the documentary evidence in the cases of Marxism, the Bolshevik State and Capitalism. In this Part is included a theoretical analysis of the State in general and of the Bolshevik State in particular, a review of the immediate perspective facing humanity, an outline of the logical and correct course for the workers, for all the oppressed groups—the Negro, the Jew and others—to follow in making history in their own interests. We do not profess impartiality in the domain of class and group interests, in the realm of history. We are definitely partial, and our view is crystallized in the process of this study. Our goal is to transform the world; our approach is—only the knowledge of the past and present in the old worlds can lead to the construction of a new one.

With the next chapter commences the unfolding of the investigation proper.

CHAPTER II.

LENIN'S BREAK WITH STALIN

1. *A Factional Situation in the Georgian Bolshevik Party*

It is universally known that Lenin was the chief political guide in the Bolshevik struggle for the overthrow of the Russian bourgeoisie. "From beginning to end the insurrection was inspired by the Central Committee of the Party, with Comrade Lenin at its head." (Stalin, *Pravda,* Nov. 6, 1918; *The October Revolution* by Stalin, Int. Publ. 30). The concrete operations which triumphantly secured the physical seizure of power by the Bolsheviks were directed by Trotsky. "All practical work in connection with the organization of the uprising was done under the immediate direction of Comrade Trotsky, the President of the Petrograd Soviet. It can be stated with certainty that the Party is indebted primarily and principally to Comrade Trotsky for the rapid going over of the garrison to the side of the Soviet and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the efficient manner in which the work of the Military-Revolutionary Committee was organized." (Stalin, *Ibid.*)

From all the available data it is reasonable to assume that toward the close of the Lenin period in 1922-1923 the figures standing above all others in authority were: Lenin, the founder of Bolshevism and the head of the State; Trotsky, in the first months of power Commissar of Foreign Affairs, shortly after, Commissar of War; Stalin, Commissar of Nationalities and, most important, General Secretary of the Bolshevik Party; Kamenev, President of the Moscow Soviet and Lenin's alternate in the Council of People's Commissars; Zinoviev, President of the Petrograd Soviet and President of the Communist International. All five were members of the Politburo, the highest organ of the Party and the actual lever of power in the State.

It is a characteristic failing of contemporaries not to be able to distinguish a vital figure in history until the importance of the figure is generally perceived. Stalin played not only a prominent role during the Lenin regime but, unquestionably, became the dominant figure in the Bolshevik Party and the State soon after Lenin's death. Yet he was little noticed in the early official Bolshevik publications. An idea can be gathered from the amount of space alloted to his political biography in the "Notes" to volume XIV of Lenin's *Collected Works* printed by the State Publishing House in 1923. As compared with 31 lines for Trotsky, 24 for Kamenev, 14 for Zinoviev, Stalin received only 9. The bourgeois correspondents in the first five years of the Bolshevik State either ignored Stalin or were not aware of his existence: "It is an extraordinary fact that the man who has actually ruled Russia ever since Lenin's death a dozen years ago and the last eight or nine years ruled without a rival, did not rate a single item in the Russian dispatches of this newspaper during the first five years of Soviet history." (*New York Times,* August 28, 1936)

In the Autumn of 1922 Lenin resolved to deprive Stalin of the Post of General Secretary, which was the key to the control of the Bolshevik Party and the State administrative machinery. More than three years after Lenin's death, Stalin himself, in an unguarded moment, publicly divulged that Lenin's policy was to dismiss him from this post. He made the disclosure in a speech at the October 1927 Plenary Session of the Central Committee and the Control Committee of the Bolshevik Party. The speech was widely distributed in the Soviet Union through *Pravda,* the official organ of the Party. It was translated into many languages and printed by the Communist International (Comintern) in its publication, the *International Press Correspondence (Inprecorr).* Stalin's disclosure reads:

"It has been said that in this 'testament' Comrade Lenin suggested to the Congress that it weigh the question of replacing Stalin in the post of General Secretary with another comrade. *This is perfectly true.* Let us read this passage although it has been read before at the Plenum several times. Here it is:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

'Stalin is too rude, and this fault, quite tolerable in our own midst and in the relations among us Communists, becomes intolerable in the post of General Secretary. I therefore propose that the comrades think about a method of removing Stalin from this post and appointing to this post another person who in all other respects is different from Stalin only in one way, namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite and more attentive to comrades, less capricious, and so forth.'" (Stalin, *Pravda,* Nov. 2, 1927, #251 (3783), p. 4, column 5; *Inprecorr,* Nov. 17, 1927, #64, p. 1428. Our emphasis—G. S.)

Stalin made no mention of the date of Lenin's Testament. According to a number of sources it was dated January 4, 1923. Evidently Lenin addressed it to the forthcoming Twelfth Congress of the Bolshevik Party (April 1923), the last during his life. Indications are that it was not only Stalin's rudeness, the matter of his loyalty and the other features indicated in the Testament that prompted Lenin to call for his dismissal. There was, in addition, the Georgian Affair. Stalin had met with an oppositional tendency in Georgia and one of his associates had resorted to nakedly brutal methods against the Georgian Bolshevik leaders. They appealed to Lenin and he eventually took their side. Because Lenin at that time was severely hampered by illness he in turn appealed to Trotsky to put up a fight against Stalin in the Central Committee of the Party. According to Trotsky's testimony, Lenin's secretary Fotieva brought a number of documents and the following note to him: " 'Esteemed Comrade Trotsky: I wish very much to ask you to take upon yourself the defense of the Georgian affair in the Central Committee of the Party. At present, the affair is under the "persecution" of Stalin and Dzerzhinsky, and I cannot rely on their impartiality. Quite the opposite. If you were to undertake the defense, my mind would be at rest. If for some reason you cannot agree to do so, please return the entire matter to me; I shall consider that a sign of your refusal.' " (Cited by Leon Trotsky in *My Life,* Rus. ed. II, 220-1)

Trotsky asserts that relations between Lenin and Stalin had by then reached the stage of sharp conflict.

From a further exchange of remarks with Fotieva, as reported by Trotsky, it appears that Lenin had completely lost confidence in Stalin. To Trotsky's query " 'Then the matter has reached a point that Vladimir Ilyich no longer thinks that a compromise with Stalin is possible even on the right line?' " he received the answer, " 'Yes, Ilyich does not trust Stalin, and wants to come out against him before the entire party.' " (222)

Trotsky states that in that period, in March 1923, about a month before the Twelfth Congress of the Bolshevik Party, the Lenin-Stalin antagonism reached the breaking point. Lenin sent a letter to Stalin informing him that all comradely relations between them were terminated: "The last letter which Lenin ever wrote in his life—or rather dictated—was a letter to Stalin breaking off all comradely relations

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with him. Comrade Kamenev told me of that letter on the same night when it was written (March 5-6, 1923). Comrade Zinoviev described that letter at the united plenum of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee. The existence of the letter was confirmed in the stenographic copy of the testimony of M. I. Ulianova [Lenin's sister—G. S.]" *(The Real Situation in Russia,* 308)

If Lenin found himself compelled to show such an explicit hostility to Stalin then his patience must have passed beyond the point reached in his Testament. Trotsky asserts that such precisely was the case:

"Having gone too far to retreat, spurred on by his own faction, fearing that concentrated attack whose threads all issued from the sickbed of his dread enemy, Stalin was already going headlong, was *openly* recruiting partisans by the distribution of party and Soviet positions, was *terrorizing* those who appealed to Lenin through Krupskaya, and was more and more persistently issuing rumors that Lenin was already not responsible for his actions. Such was the atmosphere from which rose Lenin's letter *breaking with Stalin* absolutely. No, it did not drop from a clear sky. It meant merely that the *cup of endurance had run over.* Not only chronologically, but politically and morally, it drew a *last* line under the attitude of Lenin to Stalin." *(The Suppressed Testament of Lenin,* 31. Our emphasis—G. S.)

It was in the intensity of the conflict that the sick Lenin requested Trotsky to take upon himself the defense of the Georgian case. The acuteness of Lenin's feelings is further attested to by the title he gave the aggregate of documents dealing with Stalin's machinations in Georgia, as reported to Trotsky by Lenin's two secretaries, Fotieva and Glasser: " 'Vladimir Ilyich is preparing a bomb for Stalin at the Twelfth Congress.' That was Fotieva's phrase, verbatim. The word 'bomb' was Lenin's, not hers." *(My Life,* II, 220)

Lenin's appeals to Trotsky for support lend the impression that Trotsky rallied to his side against Stalin. According to Trotsky, Lenin even took steps for the formation of a Lenin-Trotsky anti-Stalin bloc: "After a moment's thinking Lenin put the question sharply: 'You obviously propose then to open a struggle not only against the State burocracy, but against the Organizational Bureau of the Central Committee as well?' Surprised, I could not help laughing. 'That seems to be it.' The Organizational Bureau was the very heart of Stalin's apparatus.

" 'Oh, well,' Lenin went on, obviously pleased that we had called the thing by its right name, 'if that's the case, then I offer you a bloc against burocracy in general and against the Organizational Bureau in particular.'

" 'With a good man, it is an honor to form a good bloc,' I replied." (II, 216)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *How Trotsky "Adhered" to the "Bloc"*

Among Stalin's closest confederates involved in the Georgian affair were Kamenev, Dzerzhinsky and Ordjonikidze. Ordjonikidze was the one who had resorted to physical arguments against Stalin's Georgian opponents: "The fact that Ordjonikidze stood at the head of the party apparatus in the Caucasus only magnified his guilt in Lenin's eyes. Lenin sent his secretaries Glasser and Fotieva to me *several times* urging the expulsion of Ordjonikidze." (Trotsky, *The Militant,* August 27, 1932. Our emph.—G. S.)

Without going into his own motives, Trotsky reveals that he opposed Lenin on the Ordjonikidze issue: "Stalin's other ally, Ordjonikidze, Lenin thought it was absolutely necessary to expell from the party because of his burocratic high-handedness in the Caucasus. *I argued against it." (My Life,* R. II, 226. Our emph.—G. S.)

Why did Trotsky oppose Lenin's persistent appeals to bring up the question of Ordjonikidze's expulsion? The policy of retaining Ordjonikidze and moreover leaving the culprit in his capacity of an eminent leader of the Party was one of condoning internal hooliganism. A few years later Ordjonikidze participated in the physical extirpation of the Trotsky Opposition.

Even more intriguing is Trotsky's concrete opposition to Lenin's determination to eliminate Stalin from power. This is especially clear from the conversation Trotsky records having held with Kamenev, then Stalin's close ally. Kamenev, according to Trotsky, received a copy of a note Lenin sent to Trotsky about the Georgian Affair. Trotsky says: "Fotieva came to me again with a note from Lenin addressed to an old revolutionary, Mdivani, and to other opponents of Stalin's policy in Georgia. Lenin wrote to them 'I am watching your cause with all my heart. I am revolted by Ordjonikidze's rough methods and Stalin's and Dzerzhinsky's connivance. I am preparing notes and a speech for you.' In a copy of the notes these lines were addressed not only to me, but to Kamenev as well." (222). In the light of Trotsky's testimony, therefore, Kamenev was familiar with Lenin's line on Stalin with respect to Georgia and with Lenin's personal break with Stalin. Kamenev came rushing to Trotsky on the very day Lenin broke off his relations with Stalin: "Kamenev was quite pale and agitated. The ground was slipping away under his feet. He did not know what to do or which way to turn. It is quite likely that he was simply afraid of my acting in an unfriendly way toward him." (223-4). But Trotsky reassured the worried man that he would make no move against him and his cohorts: " 'Remember and tell others that I have not the least intention to start a fight at the Congress for any organizational change. I am for preserving the status quo.' " And Trotsky made it lucidly clear that he was opposed to Lenin's position on the removal of Stalin: " 'I am against liquidating Stalin, against expelling Ordjonikidze, and against removing Dzerzhinsky from the transport.' " *(Ib.)*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

However, Trotsky attached a condition to his implicit rejection of Lenin's line. " 'I want a radical change in the policy on the national question, a discontinuance of persecutions of the Georgian opponents of Stalin, a discontinuance of the administrative oppression of the party, a firmer policy in matters of industrialization, and an honest co-operation in the higher centers.' " *(Ib.)*

Stalin and his close associates were making preparations to secure their policy at the forthcoming Conference of the Georgian Bolshevik Party scheduled to convene in the first half of March 1923 in Tiflis. Having outlined to Kamenev the changes he allegedly wanted Stalin to introduce and relying, presumably, on Stalin's readiness to comply, Trotsky, as is seen from his narrative, disregarded Lenin's "bomb" against Stalin. Instead of submitting an independent, anti-Stalin position for the Georgian Conference, Trotsky amended Stalin's resolution: "I gave my resolution the form of amendments to Stalin's to make it easier for him to alter policy." *(Ib.)*

Thus, according to Trotsky's own testimony, in their attitudes toward the General Secretary, Lenin and Trotsky diverged. Lenin broke with Stalin; Trotsky, after agreeing to a bloc with Lenin, entered into negotiations for a compromise with Stalin—against Lenin's warning to steer clear of such a course. References to that warning are found in various Trotskyist publications. *Bulleten Oppositsii* for October 1936 states: "In March 1923 Lenin was making ready for a struggle against Stalin at the Twelfth Congress of the Party. Through his secretary Fotieva he told Trotsky—not to enter into negotiations with Stalin, for 'Stalin will conclude a rotten compromise and then he will deceive.' "

During his conversation with Kamenev on the night Lenin sent his final word of rupture to Stalin, Trotsky observed, as we have seen, that—"Kamenev was quite pale and agitated." But when Trotsky reassuredly declared that he was against removing Stalin—"Kamenev gave a sigh of relief. He accepted all my proposals." *(My Life,* 224). The striking transformation in Kamenev's spirit is not difficult to understand. Having a keen interest in the preservation of the Stalin staff on which he was an important figure. Kamenev had been uneasy lest Trotsky take a stand against the General Secretary and declare for his removal from power. Trotsky's reassurance conditional upon Stalin's fulfillment of certain commitments relieved Kamenev's mind. "Late that night Kamenev informed me that he had gone to see Stalin in the country and that Stalin accepted all the terms." *(Ib.)*

Astute politicians Stalin and Kamenev were quick to grasp that Trotsky was not upholding Lenin. Trotsky's terms could easily be disregarded and his amendments to Stalin's resolution disposed of at the Georgian Conference by means of Ordjonikedze's and Kamenev's "democratic" wire-pulling. It is inconceivable that Trotsky, also an astute politician, failed to realize, especially in light of Lenin's warning, that Stalin's acceptance of the terms would be sheer pretense.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

With Lenin paralyzed and with Trotsky merely grafting amendments onto Stalin's resolution instead of sending one independent of and against Stalin's, the anti-Stalin wing of the Georgian leadership whom Trotsky had allegedly undertaken to defend was left without political props. "Stalin's faction routed Lenin's faction in the Caucusus." (Leon Trotsky, *Stalin,* 361)

Viewed from the angle of Lenin's policy, the Georgian case was by no means closed. Ahead loomed the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Bolshevik Party and it was there that the anti-Stalin fight was to be joined, first of all on the national question which embraced the Georgian affair: "It was upon the national question that Lenin intended to give his first battle to the burocracy, and especially to Stalin, at the 12th Congress of the Party in the Spring of 1923." (Trotsky, *Revolution Betrayed,* 170)

Lenin's third stroke of paralysis occurred on March 9, 1923. The 1922-1923 events prior to the stroke had marked a sharp turning point in the relations among Lenin, Stalin and Trotsky. Briefly, the salient features in these relations were: Lenin's policy to remove Stalin, as enunciated in the Testament (January 1923) and admitted by Stalin himself (October 1927); Lenin's breaking off of all comradely relations with Stalin (March 5-6, 1923); his intention to smash the Stalin ring and as the first step, obviously, to expell Ordjonikidze. Trotsky's policy of uninterrupted comradely relations with Stalin, negotiations and agreement on a policy in Georgia, explicit rejection of Lenin's policy for the removal of Stalin, opposition to Lenin's proposal to expel Ordjonikidze. One important observation: the whole situation in the leadership was concealed with a cloak of secrecy; not a single revealing word found its way into the official press of that period. Lenin's Testament, Trotsky's understanding with Kamenev and Stalin—all remained backstage.

3. *Trotsky at the Seventh All-Ukrainian Conference*

Following all the foregoing there took place the Seventh All-Ukrainian Bolshevik Party Conference convening early in April 1923 in Kharkov.

In this period the Russian Bolshevik Central Committee was under the organizational and political guidance of Stalin and his two associates, Zinoviev and Kamenev: "They became, Zinoviev and Kamenev—with Stalin they created the so-called 'Troika' or Triumvirate, which was the directing body of the Central Committee of the Party and of the country during the period from the end of 1922 to 1925." *(The Case of Leon Trotsky,* 77). The Central Committee sent a representative to the Ukrainian Communist Party Conference ostensibly to familiarize the delegates as well as the workers of the Ukraine with the activities of the Russian leadership. This trusted representative had full knowledge of the true activities of the Stalin-directed

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Committee, as well as of Lenin's policy to reorganize the leadership of the Party, for the man was none other than Trotsky! "In an interview with the reporter of *Ratau* Comrade Trotsky informed him that the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party had assigned him to report on the activities of the Central Committee at the all-Ukrainian party conference." *(Pravda,* April 6, 1923)

It was exactly three months after Lenin produced his Testament and one month since Lenin had appealed to Trotsky against the General Secretary, and even less than a month since the Troika's burocratic triumph in Georgia. Was there a danger to the Troika in delegating Trotsky to address the important Ukrainian Conference? Would he lift the curtain on the backstage machinations of the Stalin leadership?

The opening of the Seventh All-Ukrainian Party Conference was attended by Party members, Red Army men and non-party workers and peasants. They eagerly assembled to get a clear view of the recent activities of the Russian leadership, which guided not only Russia but also the Ukraine, Georgia and all the other component parts of the Soviet Union.

The printed text of Trotsky's speech and the reaction of the audience show that he talked of matters not even remotely bearing on the burocratic activities of the Stalin leadership of the Central Committee or on Lenin's policy to dismiss Stalin: "The speech of Comrade Trotsky shook the huge auditorium. Many listened with tears in their eyes. Towards the end of the speech the crowd of non-party delegates surrounding Trotsky became denser. He ended the speech amidst sepulchral stillness. There was a long pause, then a storm of applause shook the entire hall." *(Pravda,* April 6, 1923)

At the next session the Conference got down to business. "The business of the Conference began with the hearing of Comrade Trotsky's report on the tasks of the Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party." *(Izvestia,* April 11, 1923). The task of Stalin's removal, as called for in Lenin's Testament, was clearly outlined in Trotsky's mind, but not in his words. "As a result of Comrade Trotsky's report a resolution has been adopted in which the Conference greeted the *correct* line of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party and with satisfaction noted the firm and capable leadership. The Conference considers that the party is solidly unified, the influence of the masses grows everywhere." *(Ib.* Our emph.—G. S.). This pro-Stalin resolution, drawn up in line with Trotskys' report, demonstrates that Trotsky was fulfilling his commission as an agent of Stalin.

During the Ukrainian Conference Lenin lay semi-conscious, isolated from the outside world. Yet at the opening of the Conference Trotsky proposed a telegram to Lenin which, Trotsky realized, could not be shown to the sick man but, on the other hand, would be read by workers inside and outside the Soviet Union. The telegram was

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

worded in such a way as to lead the workers to the inescapable conclusion that the Ukraine together with the rest of the Soviet Union was being guided in the spirit of Lenin's *current* policy: "Comrade Trotsky proposes to send Comrade Lenin a telegram saying: 'To our friend and teacher, irreplaceable friend of the oppressed proletariat of the entire world, suffering for humanity, to our dear Ilyich the 7th All Ukrainian Conference sends its flaming greetings, and pledges to carry on its work in the spirit which Ilyich taught and teaches us." *(Izvestia,* April 7, 1923)

A deeply significant undertone ran through Trotsky's entire report. It was the same sound that occurred in Trotsky's strange words spoken to Kamenev a month before: "I am for preserving the status quo." At one point in his report the undertone suddenly became dominant and rose to the highest pitch: "If we are faced with a question which in its very foundation not only requires no reviewing but doesn't even allow *a thought* of reviewing, it is the question of the dictatorship of the Party and of its *leadership* in *all phases* of our work. Yesterday we had here a clear demonstration of non-partyites in favor of this dictatorship and of this *leadership." (Pravda,* April 12, 1923. Our emphasis—G. S.)

Confidence in Stalin was what Trotsky was spreading among the Ukrainian workers and peasants and among the masses of the Soviet Union—contrary to the line in the Testament. Though conscious that there was a cleavage between Lenin and the Stalin leadership, Trotsky painted a distorted picture of the inner-Party situation: "There can be no doubt whatsoever that the Party at present is on the revolutionary alert, firm and in unanimous accord." *(Ib.)*

The great stress Trotsky put on the supposedly prevailing unity in the Party, his rejection of a change in the leadership seem strange in view of a conversation he says he had with Lenin in December 1922 concerning the growing burocratic corruption in the leadership: " 'Vladimir Ilyich, I am convinced that in the present fight against burocratism in the Soviet *apparat* we must not lose sight of what is going on: a very special selection of officials and specialists, Party members and non-partisans, in the Center and in the provinces, even for district and local Party offices, is taking place on the basis of loyalty to certain dominant Party personalities and ruling groups inside the Central Committee itself. Every time you attack a minor official, you run up against an important Party leader.' " *(Stalin,* 365)

Was there a political and organizational tie between Trotsky and the Trio? It is obvious that when the Stalin Central Committee sent Trotsky as its representative to report on its activities and on the tasks of the Twelfth Congress, the Trio was on solid ground. Is it a wonder that Trotsky's line of endorsing Stalin's leadership and policy evoked from Petrovsky, an outstanding member of the Ukrainian Central Committee, an ardent call to the old Bolshevik leading cadres to rally around Trotsky and Stalin!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Let us hope that Ilyich will recover from his illness. At present the old guard must rally around his name and also around our experienced leaders, Comrade Trotsky, Stalin and others." *(Izvestia,* April 7, 1923)

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST STALINIST CONGRESS OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

1. *Trotsky and Stalin Vying in Courtesy*

THE TWELFTH Congress convened in the middle of April 1923 hard on the heels of the Ukrainian Conference. From the outset a dispute arose between Trotsky and the Trio over the issue as to who should have the honor of making the principal report in Lenin's absence: "The most ticklish question was who should deliver this keynote address, which since the founding of the Party had always been Lenin's prerogative." *(Stalin,* 366). Since Lenin had entrusted the fight to Trotsky, it is only too obvious that the sick man intended that Trotsky act as the chief reporter presenting the indictment against the General Secretary. Paradoxically, according to Trotsky, just before the opening of the Congress, Stalin came forth with an intriguing proposal: "The question arose as to who was to make the principal political report. At the meeting of the Politburo, Stalin said, 'Trotsky, of course.' " *(My Life,* R. II, 227) Trotsky's entire policy exemplified by his attitude towards Kamenev and by his stand at the Seventh All-Ukranian Party Conference accounts for Stalin's confidence in Trotsky as a reporter. But Trotsky flatly rejected Stalin's "generous" proposal.

If Stalin's tactic was strange and mysterious, then Trotsky's choice for the main political speaker of the Congress was nothing short of fantastic. He suggested that the place of Lenin as the keynote reporter should be filled by *Stalin!* "I replied approximately as follows: 'This is an interim. Let us hope that Lenin will soon get well. In the meantime the report should be made, in keeping with his office, by the General Secretary.' " *(Stalin,* 366). In this light, the distinction between Lenin and Trotsky in their relation to Stalin is again striking. Lenin had proposed to remove and disqualify the General Secretary; Trotsky—we have his own word for it—suggested that the General Secretary, in a sense, take the place of Lenin.

There occurred—if we are to take Trotsky's testimony—one of the most ludicrously incongruous spectacles. Trotsky and Stalin were suddenly in the role of highly refined gentlemen, asking each other to perform the role customarily reserved for Lenin. Stalin stood firm as the rock of Gibraltar: "He kept repeating that the political report

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

should be made by the most influential and popular member of the Central Committee after Lenin: i.e., Trotsky, and that the Party did not expect and would not understand anything else." *(My Life,* II, 228). Trotsky would not let Stalin outdo him in politeness: "I continued to insist on Stalin making the report." *(Stalin,* 366). But Stalin stubbornly turned down the honor: " 'Under no circumstances,' he replied with demonstrative modesty. 'The Party will not understand it. The report must be made by the most popular member of the Central Comittee.' " *(Ib.).* The deadlock was finally broken when "The trio decided that the political report should be made by Zinoviev. I put up *no objection* when after due preparation behind the scenes, the question was put before the Politbureau." *(My Life,* II, 228. Our emphasis—G. S.). Thus, having completely veered in the opposite direction from Lenin's line to remove Stalin from power and to reorganize the Party leadership at the Twelfth Congress, Trotsky factually turned over the lead of the Congress to Stalin's Trio.

2. *Trotsky's Point of Disagreement*

When Trotsky sought to persuade Stalin to act as the central political figure at the Twelfth Congress, he advanced, in addition to the reason that Stalin was General Secretary, the argument that he had serious differences with Stalin:

" 'In the meantime the report should be made, in keeping with his office, by the General Secretary. That will eliminate all grounds for idle speculations. Besides, you and I have serious differences on economic questions, and I am in the minority.'

" 'But suppose there were to be no differences?' Stalin asked, letting me understand that he was ready to go far in making concessions, i.e., to conclude a rotten compromise.

"Kalinin intervened in this dialogue. 'What differences?' he asked. 'Your proposals always pass through the Politburo.' " *(Stalin,* 366)

What those "serious differences" were Trotsky did not specify. In the stenographic records of the Twelfth Congress, published by the Stalin leadership, there is not even a miscroscopic difference to be detected on any question between Trotsky's position and Stalin's. That no disagreements between him and Stalin were present, Trotsky testifies in his autobiography: "There were no visible disagreements, as the Trio did not have any line of its own." *(My Life,* II, 228)

In the above statement Trotsky asserts that the Trio did not have an independent line. The Trio's line was to *maintain* the Stalin regime; this certainly was contrary to Lenin's position for *removing* the Stalin regime. Significantly, in the very next lines of his narrative Trotsky contradicts himself when he points out that the Trio took the offensive against him personally. This indeed demonstrates that the Trio had its own specific policy at the Congress:

"At the last moment before the Congress, Kamenev proposed a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

supplement about the peasantry to my resolution, which had already been approved. There is no sense in dwelling on the essence of this amendment, which was of no theoretical or political character, but was of a provocative nature to serve as a prop for accusations—so far, only behind the scenes—of my 'underappreciation' of the peasantry. Three years after his break with Stalin, Kamenev, with his characteristic good-humored cynicism, told me how they had cooked up this accusation, which of course none of its authors took seriously." (228-9)

It is self-evident that when Trotsky prior to the opening of the Congress said that he and Stalin had differences on economic questions, there really were no differences, because Trotsky's position *was approved without discussion*. It was only at the last moment that an amendment, without doubt totally unforeseen by Trotsky, was added to his resolution. Hence, in the period embracing several months before the Twelfth Congress the relations among Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin passed through the following stages: (1) Lenin took a position for the removal of Stalin from the post of General Secretary, as testified by Stalin himself; (2) Trotsky adopted a policy of compromise with Stalin, as certified by Trotsky himself; (3) after a brief interlude of peace between Trotsky and the Trio, a provocative secret attack, according to his record, was launched against him personally.

3. *The Suppression of Lenin's Line*

Though the Trio apparently was well in control of the situation and made extensive preparations to bury the Georgian scandal, the belated echoes of that internal scandal reverberated on the floor of the Twelfth Congress. And the reverberations came not from Trotsky, in whose care Lenin had left the Georgian case, but from the Georgian leaders against whom the Trio had carried out its coup. Budu Mdivani, who had been removed by Stalin from the directing post in Georgia, was present at the Congress in capacity of consultative delegate, with voice but no vote. He and his Georgian comrades, Makharadze and Tsintsadze, bitterly complained on the floor of the Congress against persecution instituted by the Stalin leadership. Stalin in his report, and his loyal Georgians Ordjonikidze and Enukidze in their speches, loosed their thunderbolts against Mdivani and his comrades. Far from denying persecution of Stalin's opponents in Georgia. Ordjonikidze put the blame upon the victims themselves and thus inadvertently bore out their accusations:

"Comrade Makharadze painted here a picture of horrors: how they have been hounded, etc. . . . There was persecution, declared Comrade Makharadze. However, he too was persecuting, and even more than those who persecuted him." *(Twelfth Congress of the Russian Communist Party, Sten. Rep.* Rus. 158)

Many years afterward Trotsky officially stated that on December

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

31, 1922, Lenin had written a letter addressed to the Twelfth Congress, urging that Stalin and Dzerzhinsky be held responsible for the policy in Georgia. Quoting the vital anti-Stalin remark from that message, Trotsky indicated that the letter had come into his possession before the Twelfth Congress:

" 'It is, of course, necessary to hold Stalin and Dzerzhinsky responsible for all this out-and-out Great Russian nationalistic campaign.' (From Lenin's letter of December 31, 1922)

"Vladimir Ilyich sent me this letter at the moment when he felt that he would hardly be able to appear at the Twelfth Congress." (*Stalin School of Falsification,* 68)

The stenographic record of the Twelfth Congress established the existence of Lenin's letter. References to the letter were made by various speakers. Not a hint about it, however, appeared in the Bolshevik press under the guardianship of the Trio nor in Trotsky's speeches. In the letter Lenin severely assailed Ordjonikidze, terming his action in Georgia as that of a police bully. On the floor of the Congress, Enukidze defended Ordjonikidze against Lenin. Blinking at the fact that the "Central Committee" was guided by the secret Stalin faction, Enukidze excused Ordjonikidze on the ground that the man had only carried out the policy of the Central Committee!

"Now comrades, many reproaches were flung here, and this above all made the impression on comrades that the policy of Ordjonikidze was a policy of violence, a policy of a police bully. This expression, comrades, was used there in letters, at meetings, in conversations, in conferences. This term was used also in the document of Comrade Lenin which is known to you. About this document I'll say a few words later. But in reality, was that policy of such nature? Comrade Ordjonikidze carried out the policy of the Central Committee. He had to carry out that policy, otherwise he would have been a worthless representative of the center." (*Sten. Rep.* 538)

As he promised, Enukidze did comment on Lenin's document. He conceded that Lenin's letter was sharply worded but insinuated that Lenin was a victim of misinformation. Yet Enukidze had but just admitted that reference to Ordjonikidze's high-handedness had been made not only in Lenin's letter but in various other letters, in speeches and conferences. He perverted the truth as follows:

"The major portion of Comrade Lenin's letter known to you is devoted to the general questions of our national policy, and naturally neither Comrade Stalin nor Comrade Ordjonikidze will argue against these basic ideas. As to the distinct issues mentioned in his letter, specifically concerning that point, then, I think, Comrade Lenin has been made victim of one-sided, false information. If to a man who, because of illness, has no possibility of watching the daily work, people come and complain that in such-and-such place certain comrades are offended, beaten up, driven out, removed, etc., he naturally would have to write such a sharp letter." (541)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

At this juncture a voice interrupted Enukidze: "Why is the letter not being published?" *(Ib.)*. Lest one imagine that it was Trotsky's voice we hasten to report that the interruption came from Mdivani. Enukidze evasively replied that all the delegates were familiar with the contents of Lenin's letter, implying that there was no point in making the letter known to the Party membership.

Another delegate to the Congress, Yakovlev, made an outright demand for the publication of Lenin's letter. Zinoviev, quickly grasping the danger of such a demand, revealed the fact that the Presidium of the Congress had decided to withhold the document from publication:

"Comrade Yakovlev demanded that the letter in question from Comrade Lenin should be published. The Presidium of the Congress of the Party adopted on this question a *unanimous* decision: not to publish for the time being this document in view of the character of those instructions given by Vladimir Ilyitch himself. If the letter has not been published up to now it is exclusively because of the indicated reason." (552. Our emph.—G. S.)

The purpose behind the suppression of Lenin's document "for the time being" was to prevent scrutiny and investigation on the part of the revolutionary workers. Zinoviev implied that Lenin had given instructions to keep his letter from the workers. But Trotsky in *The Stalin School of Falsification* states that the excuse was a pretense: "The exhaustive and fundamental letter of Lenin on the national question is concealed from the party to this day. The pretense that Lenin did not intend his letter to be read to the party is false to the core." (68)

Since, as Trotsky revealed after a span of years, Lenin's letter on the national question was in fact an appeal to the Party, the deliberate act of the Presidium of the Congress in withholding Lenin's anti-Stalin document from the knowledge of the Party membership takes on a grim meaning. Beyond all dispute this letter, mentioning Stalin by name and severely attacking him and his policies, could have been used as a weapon against him in the hands of the revolutionary workers in the Bolshevik Party and in the Comintern. The gross and flagrant act of the Presidium in suppressing this letter speaks eloquently of the motives of its members to retain, or win, a prominent spot in the Stalin leadership.

In connection with the suppression of Lenin's letter, an act disclosed purely incidentally by Zinoviev, it is necessary to mention another highly significant landmark in Trotsky's relation with Stalin. On page 4 of the *Stenographic Report* are listed the members of the Presidium of the Twelfth Congress. Among the names Stalin, Voroshilov, Ordjonikidze, Molotov, Kalinin, Zinoviev and others there is recorded the name of *Trotsky!* It seems plain, therefore, that Trotsky participated with the Stalin faction in the unanimous decision to con-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ceal Lenin's anti-Stalin letter from the Party membership and shared in Zinoviev's pretense that Lenin did not intend the letter for the Party. Paradoxically, it was the Mensheviks, enemies of Lenin and the Comintern, who, having somehow learned of the letter, printed the information in their Berlin journal:

"The Congress was tense with expectation awaiting what Trotsky was going to say. For a time it appeared that a conflicting atmosphere would develop. It was being said that the 'Troika's' nervousness was quite apparent. In the corridors there was talk about Trotsky having in his possession a letter of Lenin's in which Lenin, foreseeing that he would be unable to attend the Congress, asked Trotsky to take upon himself the defense of the correct line in the economic and national policy of the Party. Such a letter really exists, and Trotsky could have referred to 'high authority' that precisely he was the true successor. But he did not do it and in general did not put up a battle." *(Sotsialistichesky Vestnik,* Sep. 1, 1923)

The Menshevik report pointed to Trotsky as the man who gave the Trio the opportunity to entrench itself in command:

"At any rate, Trotsky, whatever his motives, gave the 'Troika,' without a serious struggle, the possibility to reinforce its dominating position. Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin emerged from the Congress as the recognized, legal 'heirs.' And yet, at one point of their pretension to the role of those who most loyally expressed Lenin's will, they stumbled against a serious resistance, and on this point, on the national question, they were morally beaten. Here the opposition—primarily the Caucasians—could pit against the disciples the teacher himself. In the hands of the opposition was a curious document—an unpublished (illegal!) article of Lenin written by him yet at the end of last year. In this article Lenin mercilessly attacked the policy of Stalin and Ordjonikidze in the Caucasus and also Dzerzjinsky who went to the Caucusus to investigate and who supported Stalin. The article was typed out in many copies and before the Congress convened was circulated among the 'tops' of the Party and later also among the delegates of the Congress. What is interesting in the article is not only that Lenin exposes in it the 'great Russian nationalism' of the Georgian Stalin and of the Pole Dzerjinsky, but also that it is written in such acrimonious tone as if (such is the impression of all those who read it) Lenin was preparing to discredit to the utmost and annihilate politically those whom he attacked." *(Ib.)*

As is seen from this citation, the Menshevik informant was revealing some very vital facts to the workers which Stalin, Zinoviev and Trotsky concealed. The report also recounted Trotsky's loyal support to the policy of the Stalin Central Committee:

"Even as late as the present moment nothing has been heard of any separate political program of Trotsky. Both before the Congress and at the Congress Trotsky came forth as the most loyal interpreter of the general policy of the Central Committee." *(Ib.)*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Mensheviks, obviously without knowing what had secretly taken place between Trotsky and the Stalin Trio, hit the nail on the head when they recognized that Trotsky had no separate policy, that he stood up as a loyal supporter of Stalin's policies. The Mensheviks had access to the information regarding Lenin's policy to discredit and annihilate Stalin politically. They knew that Lenin had split with the Stalin faction. It was indeed unfortunate that the Russian and the Comintern workers did not have their own informants to secure for them the priceless facts hidden behind the scenes by Stalin and Trotsky. All they saw, as presented to them in the official Bolshevik and Comintern press, was that in the absence of Lenin all Russian leaders were solidly united on a supposedly Leninist line and that it was necessary to stand behind "our experienced leaders, Comrades Trotsky, Stalin and others" as Petrovsky had said on the eve of the Twelfth Congress. And if a few Comintern workers ever read the revealing Menshevik report they discounted it because the Menshevik policy of support to the Russian bourgeoisie during the Bolshevik Revolution and after cautioned these workers against trusting the Menshevik behind-the-stage correct information.

In the face of Lenin's Testament, which instructed the Congress to remove Stalin, and of Lenin's letter which urged to hold Stalin and his henchmen responsible for the Georgian affair, the following has been fed to the workers by the Stalin historians: "The Twelfth Congress of the Party met in April 1923. This was the first Congress, after the victory of the October Socialist Revolution, which Lenin due to illness was unable to attend. In its decisions the Congress adopted all the instructions of Lenin given in his last articles and letters." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LXII, 565)

4. *Stalin's Amazing Triumph*

The Twelfth Congress was in political actuality the first official Stalinist Congress. The feeble Georgian opposition, isolated from Lenin, seeing every high figure rallying to Stalin, abandoned the issue. Mdivani humbly drew back, remarking that he was but a provincial functionary among "big people." Trotsky kept his word to Kamenev and proved that "I am for preserving the status quo." For very good reasons therefore Stalin was jubilant. His joyous mood was mirrored in his demagogic summary: "I must say that it has been a long time since I saw a Congress so welded together and so inspired with one idea as this one." And pretending to pay warm tribute to the founder of the Party, Stalin said: "I am sorry that Comrade Lenin is not present. If he were here, I think he would have said: 'For 25 years I was nursing the Party and at last have nursed it to maturity.'" *(Pravda,* April 20, 1923). Stalin, of course, was very happy that Lenin was *not* present at the Congress. And all the high leaders understood that—especially Trotsky.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky heard the cynical words of Ordjonikidze, the lying remarks of Enukidze, witnessed the two-faced attitude of Kamenev, the artful dodging of Zinoviev and the smooth-spoken, transparently dishonest performance of Stalin. Yet quite conscious of the duplicity of the Trio and those closely united with it in a new brotherhood, Trotsky maintained a stony silence regarding the break between Lenin and the General Secretary. Trotsky concealed from the proletariat not only the "bomb" and its basic purpose but even the fact of its existence.

Had Trotsky, a member of the Politburo and the most illustrious figure at the Congress, sat silent through the sessions such attitude would have caused wonder throughout the world. In the interest of preserving the dignified revolutionary appearence assumed by the Trio, Trotsky had to speak on some topic. Trotsky's voice rang out but not to pierce the cloud of hypocrisy in which the Congress was enveloped. With painstaking thoroughness Trotsky spoke of industry and agriculture, of the discrepancy between the price of grain and that of manufactured products. He touched on the subject of coal, oil, textiles, the economic aspects of Europe and America. His report occupied an entire session of the Congress. In the concluding speech Trotsky again dealt with textiles, with Europe and America—but he uttered not a word of exposure of the burocratic Russian-nationalist policy of the Stalin Central Committee, not a hint of Lenin's proposal of organizational changes in the Party leadership.

The Stalin-controlled press gave a glowing account of Trotsky's report, focusing attention on it to divert the workers from the central problem of eliminating the burocratic corrosion that pervaded the entire economic and social fabric of the State. "With the report of Comrade Trotsky, the Party Congress, as we already wrote, approached the *central* and burning problems of the day." *(Izvestia,* April 22, 1923. Our emphasis—G. S.). About two weeks after the Congress Trotsky wrote concordantly with the line of the Trio's press: "Attention to economy! That's what the present period demands from the Party mind, and demands this sternly." (Preface to Trotsky's *Works,* VII, Rus. May 14, 1923)

The voting on the resolutions at the Congress must have been a thrilling experience to Stalin and his colleagues. "All our resolutions have been adopted *unanimously"* enthusiastically announced Zinoviev, *(Pravda,* April 26, 1923, Zinoviev's emphasis). Trotsky had a vote at the Twelfth Congress; he was listed as a regular delegate representing the Moscow Party organization *(Sten. Rep.* 695). There were at the Congress several people close to Trotsky politically and personally, among them Muralov and Rakovsky, also with a vote. It is obvious that Trotsky and his companions, the future leaders of the Left Opposition, all voted for the Stalinist resolutions, since there was ***not a single abstention,*** as recorded in the Comintern press:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"The XII Party Congress was the first conducted without Lenin. . . . All the resolutions of the Party Congress were passed unanimously. When the Party Congress accepted the general resolution on the policy of the Central Committee *without a single abstention or contrary voice,* all the delegates rose and sang the 'Internationale.' All felt the historic significance of that moment." (G. Safarov, *Die Internationale,* June 1, 1923, 325. Our emph.—G. S.)

In rendering Stalin their full support and approval, Trotsky and his cronies automatically lent a legitimate air to the provocation-clause about the peasantry which had been inserted in his resolution by the Trio.

Even more sharply conscious was Trotsky in glorifying Stalin's organizational machine. This body had been the subject of the conversation Trotsky says he had with Lenin several months earlier. During the interval between that discussion and the Twelfth Congress burocratism in the Organizational Buro of the Central Committee grew. But the *Resolution on the Report of the Central Committee* covered up the actual trend: "The Congress notes with satisfaction the improvement of the organizational apparatus of the Central Committee and of the whole organizational work of the Party center in general. . . ." *(Izvestia,* April 20, 1923). Knowing that the Resolution was a cloak for the burocratic ravages carried on by Stalin's apparatus, Trotsky sought by every possible means to enhance the prestige of that document: "In the Resolution on the report of the Central Committee we formulated the dictatorship of the Party in more exact terms than ever before." (Trotsky's concluding remarks at the Twelfth Congress, *Pravda,* April 24, 1923)

The Menshevik reporter in Moscow, who could not have possessed the full inside information Trotsky had, remarked about the felicitous feeling of the Trio: "And yet, the 'heirs'—i.e., in the first place the now omnipotent Triumvirate: Zinoviev, Kamenev and Stalin—were departing from the Congress not without a feeling of relief, and in all probability sincerely rejoiced that they so easily secured for themselves the dominant position." *(Sots. Vest.* Sep. 1, 1923). Since Trotsky in everybody's mind loomed as the logical successor to Lenin, the Menshevik reporter figured that the Trio had been confronted with a knotty problem regarding Trotsky: "For the above-mentioned Troika the chief problem was to render Trotsky fully 'harmless' as the most powerful candidate for the role of the factual substitute for the head of the government who fell out of the ranks." *(Ib.).* But the "problem" was sheerly imaginary because the Trio found in Trotsky not a rival but a most loyal supporter and protector.

5. *Trotsky Offers an "Explanation"*

Trotsky probably realized that inquisitive readers of *My Life* might raise the question of his failure to back Lenin. Conscious of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his immense stature during the period of the Twelfth Congress, Trotsky asserts that he would have been victorious even without Lenin's direct participation: "Our joint action against the Central Committee at the beginning of 1923 would definitely have brought us victory. And what is more, *I have no doubt* that if I had come forward on the eve of the Twelfth Congress in the spirit of a 'bloc of Lenin and Trotsky' against the Stalin burocracy, *I should have been victorious* even if Lenin had taken no direct part in the struggle." *(My Life,* II, 218-19. Our emph.—G. S.). The significant phrase "if I had come forward" implicitly confirms that Trotsky did *not* come forward to give battle to Stalin. What prevented him from demanding the removal of the General Secretary? Trotsky presents the following as the explanation: "My action would have been interpreted, or, to be more exact, represented as my personal fight for Lenin's place in the Party and the State. *The very thought of this made me shudder.* I considered that this might have brought such a demoralization in our ranks that we *would have had to pay too painful a price for it even in case of victory.*" (219. Our emph.—G. S.)

How consistent is this explanation with the facts—assuming for the moment that Trotsky tells of his true feelings and beliefs in the period of the Twelfth Congress? With Lenin disabled, Trotsky stood as the most arresting, powerful personality, universally recognized as a key figure in the State. Even without the anti-Stalin ammunition supplied to him by Lenin, Trotsky's fight would never have been interpreted as a personal struggle for the sick man's place but would have been considered as a natural assumption of command by a high officer while his immediate superior is disabled in battle. But in the prevailing situation Trotsky did not even have to appear as the initiator of the struggle. All he had to do was to read Lenin's message to the Congress. This action could never have been interpreted as his personal fight for Lenin's place. Any such attempt to divert the minds from the real political and organizational issues would have only hastened Stalin's doom. Trotsky would have been viewed by the masses as standing loyally by the sick leader, performing an honest and courageous act. A remark, a hint that he was seeking to rise above his associates would have been viewed as slander—the man stood high above them, enjoying next to Lenin a far greater prestige and popularity than any man in the Soviet Union and in the Comintern.

Trotsky makes it appear he had no other choice except either risk a campaign of personal slander and possible demoralization in the Party or tolerate the regime of the Stalin clique, and he presumably chose the latter alternative although in reality, as we have seen, he chose not a policy of toleration but of active *collaboration.* But this collaboration policy Trotsky does not even attempt to explain. We have found the most illuminating facts establishing his anti-Leninist collaboration with Stalin in the *Stenographic Report of the Twelfth Congress,* in the Bolshevik press of that period and in the Menshevik

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

press. Trotsky obviously did not expect anyone to go digging into these sources and therefore did not think that his collaboration with Stalin against Lenin would be exposed. If, in the face of Lenin's anti-Stalin stand, Trotsky's mind were in a sentimentally-noble mood of rejecting the sure victory over Stalin lest the price were demoralization caused by a slander disseminated by the defeated and discredited former General Secretary, if Trotsky felt himself to be the guardian of the morale and integrity of the Party, then why did he go way beyond the limits of "mere" toleration? Why did he never account for his participation in suppressing Lenin's anti-Stalin documents? Why did he convey to the workers the misleading impression that Stalin's policy was correct when he knew full well that it was Russian-nationalist, burocratic, reactionary, contrary to the proletarian spirit and program?

Trotsky's post-exile works abound in passages vividly showing he saw clearly through Stalin's insincerity. In the book *Stalin* he recalls some jesuitical remarks of Stalin at the Twelfth Congress:

"Addressing the Congress on the 23 of April, Stalin said in his concluding remarks on the national question: 'Here very many have referred to the notes and articles of Vladimir Ilyich. I shouldn't like to quote my master, Comrade Lenin, since he is not here, for I fear that I may be referring to him incorrectly and not to the point . . .' These words undoubtedly are a model of the most extraordinary Jesuitism on record. Stalin well knew how indignantly Lenin was opposed to his national policy, how his 'master' was prevented from blowing this 'disciple' sky-high on this very issue only because of grave illness." (363-4)

Quite aptly Trotsky characterized Stalin's remarks as "a model of the most extraordinary Jesuitism on record." But how is one to assess this "criticism" in light of Trotsky's own behavior at the Twelfth Congress?

Since Trotsky was keenly conscious of the Great-Russian nature of Stalin's policy on the national question which was confirmed by the Twelfth Congress, how is one to brand the following statement of Trotsky's barely two months after Stalin's great triumph: "That is why the resolution of the Twelfth Congress of the Party on the National Question more than anything else is disturbing England. We have developed and perfected our national policy and are adopting serious measures to carry it out in all respects and first of all in the countries of the Soviet Union which have a great exemplary significance in the East." ("The Imperialists and We," *Pravda*, June 21, 1923)

What was this if not a conscious policy of reinforcing the authority of the Great Russian Stalin regime in all the national components of the Soviet Union! "We have developed and perfected our national policy" said Trotsky. The special effort Trotsky made to root the Stalin line on the national question in the Soviet Union shows conclusively that in his collaboration with Stalin he did not play a passive role but took a direct hand in building the massive system of the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Soviet Union Great-Russian nationalism. Unfortunately the vital truth remained buried in the musty archives of history, and afterward the false impression was given currency that Trotsky fought Stalin. To cover up the fact that at the Twelfth Congress Trotsky formed a close union with Stalin and helped to consolidate the Stalinist regime, Trotsky created the myth that he sided with Lenin against Stalin all along. In 1932 he wrote: "We have indicated above the sign-posts of the final struggle between Lenin and Stalin. At all these stages Lenin sought my support and *found it.*" (*Suppressed Testament of Lenin,* 32, Our emph.—G. S.). There is no doubt that Lenin, trusting Trotsky, sought his support in the fight against Stalin. As to Trotsky's assertion that Lenin found that support, this is an obvious deception.

6. *The Elusive Film of History*

By withholding, in turn, now one set of facts now another, Trotsky, Stalin and other Bolshevik leaders succeeded in molding false concepts of the historical process. For example, in the Spring of 1923 Trotsky's report to the Seventh All-Ukrainian Party Conference and the resolution of the Conference approving Stalin's policies were available to the workers. So were the resolutions of the Twelfth Congress, Trotsky's article in which he clearly extolled Stalin's national policy, the ringing accounts of the unity established among Stalin, Trotsky and other leaders who buried Lenin's policy. But the evidence of the Russian-nationalist political line of Stalin's Central Committee in 1922-23 and of Lenin's policy to remove Stalin was *not* available to the revolutionary workers at that time—except for a fraction of the evidence in the press of the Mensheviks who were utterly discredited among the revolutionary masses. Reading *Pravda* and *Izvestia* in 1922-23, listening to the general acclaim of the Stalin-Trotsky leadership, but having no knowledge of the data put out much later in *My Life, The Suppressed Testament of Lenin, The Stalin School of Falsification* and other works of Trotsky, they developed a penchant for worshipping the Stalin leadership. If the evidence of the conflict between Lenin and Stalin, of Lenin's misplaced confidence in Trotsky, had been presented to them *together* with the official unanimous resolutions of the Twelfth Congress, Trotsky's article in support of Stalin on the national question, and other open documents, the true picture would have become discernible to them.

On the other hand, when Trotsky, exiled from the Soviet Union, began to divulge, in driblets, the data concerning Lenin's policy to remove Stalin and other facts, the formerly hidden evidence became available to many revolutionary workers; but the documentary evidence of Trotsky's pro-Stalin line, as registered in the Bolshevik Party publications of 1922-23, remained unknown to them or had faded from their memory. Unfortunately all the basic parts of the Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin picture were never assembled before in one piece and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

presented to the workers. In consequence, the tragic result is that the Stalin workers, nurtured in the traditional atmosphere in which the Stalin leadership from its early years was presented by all the Bolshevik leaders, including Trotsky, as carrying out Lenin's policy, reject all evidence about Lenin's sharp break with Stalin and accept the lie that Trotsky fought "the Leninist Central Committee" headed by Stalin. The Trotsky workers, on the contrary, accept Trotsky's true testimony about the break between Lenin and Stalin but at the same time swallow his deceptive assertion that Lenin secured Trotsky's aid in fighting Stalin. Only by placing side by side all sets of facts, those hidden in 1923 and revealed now, and those well known in 1923 but kept out of sight today, can the true origin and course of the Stalinist burocratic development be traced.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TRIO BREAKS WITH TROTSKY

1. *Zinoviev's Vacillations; Trotsky's Firmness*

THE BUROCRATIC "unification" concluded at the Twelfth Congress was neither genuine nor lasting. From top to bottom there was a feeling of suspicion, mistrust and personal strife. The Georgian opposition no doubt hoped for Lenin's recovery to exact satisfaction from the punishment he would inflict on Stalin. One leader, Osinsky, who made an attempt at the Congress to divide the Trio by attacking Zinoviev, for which he was harshly rebuked by Stalin, must have departed with a sense of resentment, not enthusiasm. Trotsky must have been weighing the intent behind the clause which the Trio, whom he had befriended, inserted in his theses.

But within the Trio itself discord and intrigues already existed and shortly expressed themselves in certain schemes put forth by Zinoviev. Over two years afterward, at the Fourteenth Congress of the Party (Dec. 1925), Stalin stated: "In 1923, after the Twelfth Congress, some people assembled in an 'underground,' worked out a platform to abolish the Political Buro and to politicalize the Secretariat, that is, to convert the Secretariat into a political leadership by composing it out of Zinoviev, Trotsky and Stalin."

From the remarks made by various speakers at the Fourteenth Congress an idea can be formed regarding the machinations within the Trio after it had consummated the bloc with Trotsky at the Twelfth Congress. The "underground" to which Stalin made reference was the so-called "cave conference" secretly held in Kislovodsk in the Summer of 1923. Probably already then, aware of the fact, as Lenin wrote in the *Testament,* that "Comrade Stalin, having become General Secretary, has concentrated an enormous power in his hands,"

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(*N. Y. Times,* Oct. 18, 1926), Zinoviev undertook to reorganize the Trio. His scheme was to replace Kamenev with the more eminent Trotsky as a heavy counter-weight to Stalin. Informed of the plan, Stalin not only rejected the "cave" platform but even threatened to resign his post. Most, if not all, of the plotting burocrats held that Stalin should stay in the post. Therefore, had Zinoviev suggested the acceptance of Stalin's offer of resignation, he, naturally, instead of securing a curb on Stalin, would have exposed himself to a charge of seeking to maneuver himself into the seat of control. Stalin's vigorous opposition to the proposal can be attributed only to his definitive plan to remove Trotsky from power *entirely*. Trotsky, on his part, declined Zinoviev's invitation to displace Kamenev in a reorganized Trio. At the Fourteenth Congress Voroshilov testified: "Comrade Serebriakov at the open session of the Plenum of the Central Committee in November 1923 declared that Comrade Zinoviev had proposed an alliance with Comrade Trotsky. Comrade Trotsky did not deny this, but categorically rejected the bloc. The proposal of Comrade Zinoviev to Comrade Trotsky was made in 1923 prior to our sharpest clash with Comrade Trotsky and his co-thinkers." (*Sten. Rep.* 399). Present at the Fourteenth Congress, Trotsky did not refute Voroshilov's testimony.

Trotsky's policy was to maintain the status quo, as illustrated by his pledge to Kamenev and his actions, through a firm line of establishing amicable relations with the General Secretary. But this was not Stalin's policy towards Trotsky.

2. *The Hidden Drive on Trotsky*

The Trio's brand of gratitude for Trotsky's betrayal of Lenin's trust, for Trotsky's political and organizational loyalty to Stalin had been foreshadowed in Kamenev's amendment to Trotsky's report to the Twelfth Congress. The anti-Trotsky intrigue was simmering behind the scenes for some time before it came into the open. Despite the underhand campaign against Trotsky, some of his friends nourished the illusion that Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev would never dare to come out against him openly before the masses. But Trotsky did not share this illusion: "Some of my friends used to say: 'They will never dare to come out against you in the open. In the mind of the people your name is inseparably bound to Lenin's. It is impossible to erase the October revolution, the Red army, or the civil war.' I did not agree with this." (*My Life,* II, 230)

It can be readily observed that Trotsky's friends viewed the impending drive against him as a sheer intrigue. At the same time Trotsky's power of resistance, they considered, lay not in a political and organizational position to be advanced by him against the Trio, but in his immense personal prestige. The political character of these friends is obvious. Of a greater penetrating vision than they, Trotsky

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

prophetically foresaw in the extensive unofficial campaign unfolding against him the intent of bringing the attack into the open. But Trotsky had chained himself to Stalin politically and could not break the links without exposing his betrayal of Lenin's trust. Maintaining silence before the Party and the masses Trotsky behind the scenes attempted a furious but futile defense against the Trio's attack. His dismally impotent performance left the perfidious Trio perfectly cold and unperturbed.

3. *Strikes Against Stalin's Burocratism and the Rise of the Sham 1923 Opposition*

Trotsky had many jealous enemies among the Party leaders but equally he had many friends. Also there were leaders who though they disliked Trotsky at the same time abhorred the Trio whose oppressive methods were becoming too irksome. In the Party ranks generally widespread dissatisfaction with the Trio's regime gained strength particularly after the Twelfth Congress. The discontent gave rise in the Party to secret groupings opposing the burocratism of the leadership. The groups were ferreted out by the Trio and mercilessly crushed.

Outside the Party discontent among the workers expressed itself in a wave of strikes, conveying a warning to Stalin of a serious danger from below. In December 1923 Stalin made a statement on the meaning of the strike wave: "This strike wave showed that our organizations are faulty, that some of our organizations—Party and State organizations—possess inadequate contact with the events going on in the works and factories, and it also showed that some illegal organizations have been existing within the Party, anti-Communist in their essential character, and striving to divide the Party. All these deficiencies thus brought to light by the strike wave have thrown such a bright light into the eyes of the Party, have flooded it with such a blaze of sobering illumination, that it recognized the necessity of inner changes in the Party." ("Comrade Stalin on the Tasks of the Party," *Inprecor,* Feb. 8, 1924, 67. *Pravda,* Dec. 6, 1923)

In the same speech Stalin made the astounding admission that the Bolshevik State apparatus developed contrary to what Lenin and other leaders had expected in 1917 before their assumption of power:

"In 1917, when we were on the upward path towards October, we imagined that we should create a commune which would be an alliance of the workers, that we should do away with all bureaucracy in the administration, and that the state would be able to be converted, if not immediately, then in the course of two or three not too lengthy transitional periods, into an alliance of the workers. Actual practice has, however, shown us that this ideal is still far removed, and that the emancipation of the state from the elements of bureaucracy, the transformation of Soviet society into an alliance of workers, calls for a high level of culture among the population, and for a perfectly secure

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and peaceful environment, in which the necessity for the existence of great military bodies can be dispensed with. *Our state apparatus is bureaucratic, and will remain bureaucratic for some time to come.* Our Party comrades are working in this apparatus, and the environment and atmosphere of this bureaucratic apparatus is such that it facilitates the development of bureaucracy among our Party functionaries and Party organizations." (Our emphasis—G. S.)

That burocratism under Stalin continued was shown three years later in his report at the Fifteenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party (Dec. 2, 1927), several weeks after he had inadvertently admitted that Lenin's line was to remove him from power. Stalin said: "There can be no doubt that we possess certain elements of burocracy in the State, cooperative and Party machinery." In that report Stalin made another slip and indicated that he and his colleagues in power used *force* as a means of persuasion: "instead of the method of conviction which is of decisive importance for the Party, we apply administrative methods in the Party." *(Report to the Fifteenth Congress,* 67)

In 1923 Stalin could insure this future development only by pretending to introduce proletarian democracy in the Party and the State.

The drive against Trotsky was to accomplish two basic objectives for Stalin. It would start the process of reducing the more eminent figures in the Party and correspondingly increase his own political stature; it would provide him with a target to divert the attention of the workers from the burocratic practices of the Central Committee. Trotsky's pre-1917 disagreements with the Bolsheviks were an ideal background to excite the Party ranks with the fear that he "threatens the foundations of Bolshevism," and conversely, for making the Trio appear as the guardians of Bolshevism. The chief "accusation" levelled against Trotsky was that he "underestimated" the peasantry. Conveniently for the Trio, this unfounded accusation had originated with Lenin. It had been abandoned by him and all the other Bolsheviks months before the October Revolution but this fact was disregarded by Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev and their factional supporters.

Unable to counter the attacks of the Trio with an open and frank declaration on the inner state of affairs obtaining prior to and during the Twelfth Congress, Trotsky, by the same token, could not expose the perfidy of the Trio in relation to him personally. If he had, the explosion of the whole scandalous mess would have produced dire results not only for the Trio but also for himself. Of necessity Trotsky's defense was carried on behind closed doors and was limited to the denial of the "accusations" and to the counter-charges that the Stalin clique had been disloyal to Lenin. A sample of this tactic is contained in his secret letter to the Members of the Central Committee dated October 23, 1923. In it Trotsky recalled how the Stalin ring a little over two months before the Twelfth Congress had wanted to suppress Lenin's article on the reorganization of the Rabkrin (Workers and Peasants Inspection) at the head of which stood Stalin. One member

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Central Committe, Kuibyshev, had gone as far as to propose that they hoodwink Lenin. " 'In view of the insistent demand of Comrade Lenin that the article should be shown to him in print, Comrade Kuibyshev, afterward the head of the *Rabkrin,* proposed at the above-mentioned session of the Political Bureau that one special number of *Pravda* should be printed with Lenin's article and shown to him in order to placate him, while the article itself should be concealed from the party.' " *(Stalin School* etc. 72)

Trotsky withheld from the Party membership the knowledge that the Stalin leadership had attempted to suppress Lenin's article and to resort to a trick for the purpose of deceiving the sick leader. And Trotsky's unofficial chiding of Stalin came only *after* the General Secretary and his cronies had broken the bond of unity with Trotsky and commenced harassing him behind the scenes. Trotsky's secret letter of October 23, 1923, quite naturally, has been concealed by Stalin to this day. But Trotsky himself for many years kept it under the seal of secrecy, breaking it only when the logical moment for the effectiveness of its disclosure had long passed.

On October 15, 1923 a group of forty-six Party leaders, discerning an ominous sign in Stalin's rapidly growing power and the Trio's subterranean campaign to ruin Trotsky, a clear threat to the spirit of collective control, dispatched a letter to the Central Committee. We have been unable to unearth the letter itself but the subsequent behavior of the "46" known as the Democratic Centralists, or still better as the Moscow Opposition, indicates that they stood on a position of collective burocratic harmony. Trotsky himself was not officially among the "46." One of the supporters of the Moscow Opposition made a direct appeal to the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev clique along this line: "Radek sent a separate letter urging reconciliation with Trotsky inside the Political Bureau." (Trotsky, *Third International After Lenin,* Explanatory Notes, 314). The term "reconciliation" has a distinct meaning. Radek's program was restoration of the relative harmony which the Trotsky editors inadvertently acknowledge in the Explanatory Notes had prevailed prior to the Trio's break with Trotsky.

4. *The Trio-Trotsky Resolution on Workers Democracy*

On November 7, 1923, avoiding any mention of Trotsky, or of the '46," or of the workers' discontent with Stalin's policies, Zinoviev opened a vague "discussion" of the Party problems in the pages of *Pravda.* The "discussion" soon began to take on a form of controversy between the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev leadership and the Democratic Centralists led by Preobrajensky and Sapronov. The complete unanimity proclaimed with such vainglorious boasting by the entire Party burocracy at the Twelfth Congress, only seven months earlier, proved to be extremely fragile and short-lived.

Preobrajensky, who had supported all the resolutions of the Stal-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

inist Congress as correct, suddenly "discovered" that, "In my opinion, the Party already for two years carries on a basically incorrect internal line." *(Pravda,* Nov. 28, 1923)

Just as Zinoviev, Kamenev and every other associate of Stalin, the "oppositionist" Preobrajensky avoided all reference to Lenin's policy on the Stalin issue. He was well informed, for he was one of those to whom Trotsky had revealed his conversation with Lenin regarding the projected Lenin-Trotsky bloc: "Because of its political importance, I immediately repeated this conversation to a number of people (Rakovsky, I. N. Smirnov, Sosnovsky, Preobrajensky, and others)." *(My Life,* II, 215)

In the open, before the workers, the only plausible manner in which the Moscow Opposition and Trotsky could vent their hidden resentments was to use the discussion on the abstract evil of buro-cratism. The Trio too could appear in no other guise and at first was impelled to avoid any indication that it aimed at Trotsky. The control of the discussion was, naturally, in the hands of the Trio.

Stalin was more wary than his partners. Nothing in his speeches gave an inkling that behind the stage he was conducting a passionate drive for increased personal power. As a matter of clever strategy, Stalin during the first stage of the "discussion" even put in a word for Trotsky. In criticizing one, Radzin, Stalin remarked "I know Comrade Trotsky to be one of those members of the Central Committee who more than anything else stress the active side of the Party work." *(Pravda,* December 6, 1923). Stalin raised his voice in pretended recognition that all was not perfect in the Party and to allay the discontent of the workers condemned burocratic practices. The Trio, to play the role of champion of Workers Democracy, still required the cover of Trotsky. Any resolution of the Politburo on this issue without Trotsky's signature might have led to the speculation that he did not rely on the Trio's pledge to establish Workers Democracy. On December 5, 1923 Trotsky in his move for reconciliation consented to provide the Trio with the protective "democratic" shield and drew up a resolution called The Resolution of the Central Committee and the Central Control Committee on Party Building, otherwise known as the Resolution on the New Course. The joint resolution, which was jubilantly hailed by the Stalin press as a crowning achievement of revolutionary responsibility, had actually been arrived at through a horse-trade. Trotsky had secured from the Trio some "promises" of modifying the Party regime; in return he fortified the Stalin faction by agreeing to the prohibition of organized groups opposing the Trio:

"Workers democracy means liberty of frank discussion of the most important questions of the Party life by all members and that all leading Party functionaries and commissions be elected by those bodies immediately under them. It does not, however, include the liberty of forming fraction groups, which are extremely dangerous for a governing party since they continually threaten to split and disintegrate the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

government and the State apparatus as a whole." (Resolution of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission, *Pravda,* Dec. 7, 1923. *Inprecor,* Jan. 29, 1924, 38)

This point indicates Trotsky's support to the proposal by Dzerzinsky which made it obligatory for members of the Party to act as unofficial agents of the secret political police (G.P.U.) and report any factional groupings forming in the Party against the Stalin apparatus. A mention of this proposal was made by Trotsky in a secret letter to the Central Committee: "One of the proposals of Comrade Djerzinsky's commission declares that we must make it obligatory for Party members knowing about groupings in the Party to communicate the fact to the G.P.U., the Central Committee and the Central Control Commitee." (Quoted by Max Eastman in *Since Lenin Died,* 142)

In view of the fact that the Party was a burocratically-conducted institution with vast appointive power held by the secret faction controlling the Central Committee and the G.P.U., Dzerzinsky's line and the section in the Resolution of December 5, 1923 condemning the formation of factions acted as a mighty defensive and offensive weapon in the hands of the Trio. It was a potential threat to the group headed by the "46" which was backing Trotsky himself.

Did Trotsky really believe that a means could be found to halt or at least ease the clandestine drive against him? We remember his assertion that he disagreed with his friends who tried to assure him that the Trio would never dare to come out against him in the open. At best, probably, as during his conversation with Kamenev on the night of March 6, 1923, Trotsky made a pretense of believing in Stalin's compromises. Caught in a trap largely of his own making he had no other choice.

But among the workers in the Party a feeling of mistrust was evident as to the sincerity of the Politburo in promulgating the Resolution to institute authentic Workers Democracy. They had witnessed sham attacks upon burocratism before. They did not forget that the Resolution on Workers Democracy, adopted at the Tenth Party Congress in 1921 and confirmed by the Twelfth Congress, had been violated by this very leadership which now promised to eliminate the cancer of burocratism. Their lack of confidence was reflected in an observation printed in the official Stalin-guided press: "It is now in style to speak about the paper character of many decisions. Some comrades recall the 'beautiful resolutions' of the Tenth Congress and compare them with the practice which followed. Quite often the deduction is made about the fate of the present New Course." *(Pravda,* Dec. 8, 1923)

Interestingly, under the impact of its own pretense to introduce *"The New Course,"* the Trio, for a brief spell, had to create the impression among the workers that the democratic principle was being applied in the current discussion. But the avalanche of criticism from the lower levels of the Party made the burocrats jittery. For the skep-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tical workers it was too much to believe that Stalin's apparatus would suddenly acquire democratic virtues and really introduce an anti-burocratic policy. To preserve "The New Course" face, the press printed a few letters containing outspoken criticism, as the following:

"When a businesslike, serious attitude to this discussion of the 'lower nuclei' is compared with the panicky 'nervousness' of the apparatus, a thought involuntarily comes to one: will such an apparatus be able to carry out inner-Party democracy, the practical realization of which is undoubtedly essential to our entire Party." (I. Shumskaya, *Pravda,* Dec. 8, 1923)

The marked absence of confidence within the Party ranks induced a sense of uneasiness among the burocratic upper layers. At this point Trotsky again came to the assistance of the Stalin leadership. In a letter to Party meetings on "The New Course" he told the workers that the Party really arrived at a turning point: "The resolution of the Political Bureau on the Party organization bears an exceptional significance. It indicates that the Party has arrived at an important turning point in its historic road." *(Pravda,* Dec. 11, 1923; *Inprecor,* Feb. 15, 1924, 83). Upbraiding the Party members who would not take seriously the assurances that the apparatus had actually made a turn toward Workers Democracy Trotsky ridiculed their skeptical remarks: "Some comrades of a conservative disposition, who show themselves inclined to over-estimate the role of the apparatus and to under-estimate the initiative of the Party, criticize the resolution of the Political Bureau. According to their statements, the Central Committee takes upon itself obligations which cannot be carried out; the resolution would only create illusions and produce negative results." *(Ib.)* Pretending that he trusted Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, and that with them in control a democratic regime could be established in the Party, Trotsky turned the matter upside down and branded the healthy attitude of the critics as "burocratic distrust of the Party"! He reassured the workers that the old burocratic course had been dropped by the Central Committee: "It is clear that such an approach reveals a profound burocratic distrust of the Party. The center of gravity which was mistakenly placed in the apparatus by the old course, has now been transferred by the new course, proclaimed in the resolution of the Central Committee, to the activity, the initiative and the critical spirit of all the party members, as the organized vanguard of the proletariat." *(Ib.)*

By uniting with the Trio upon the Resolution of December 5, 1923 Trotsky shielded the Stalin faction and simultaneously protected the Trio in its secret operation against himself. The statement that the Resolution marked a turning point was correct but not in the sense in which Trotsky and *Pravda* meant it. The Resolution marked, or rather *masked,* a turn toward a new stage in the burocratic corruption of the Party and the Bolshevik State.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

5. *Stalin's Main Shield in the Anti-Trotsky Drive*

Beneath the official discussion on "The New Course" had been running factional whispers that Trotsky underestimated the peasantry, that he aimed to rob the peasantry and thus undermine the alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry and thereby endanger the class equilibrium and safety of the State. Uninitiated in the internal intrigues of the high-ranking leaders of the Party, the lower functionaries and workers, many of them great admirers of Trotsky, were puzzled and seriously grieved. Why suddenly such accusations clearly aimed at turning the minds of the workers and peasants against him? Many turned to Trotsky himself for light on the matter. In reply Trotsky wrote an article "On the Smytchka" in which he said:

"I am often asked by some party comrades, what are the grounds for my special attitude relative to the peasant question, and wherein do they differ from those of Comrade Lenin. Other comrades put the question in a more exact and concrete form: they ask if it be true, that I 'underestimate' the role of the peasant in our economic development and hence do not accord to the economic and political alliance between the proletariat and the peasantry (Smytchka) the importance, which it warrants. Such questions have been put to me orally as well as written. 'Where have you got hold of all this?' I asked with great astonishment, 'On what facts do you base these assertions?' The answer was mostly, 'we do not possess any facts, it is a question of rumors which are circulating.' At first I did not trouble much about these rumors until a letter which I received recently impelled me to think over the matter and to consider the origin of the rumors." *(Pravda,* Dec. 6, 1923; *Inprecor,* Jan. 4, 1924)

There was hardly another person in the Soviet Union who knew the exact source of the rumors, who realized the precise motive and purpose behind them as clearly as Trotsky—in December 1923! But Trotsky had to conceal the fact that the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev leadership of the Party was plotting to tear him down. The least hint would have produced a political and organizational cyclone. To still the workers' minds he feigned astonishment. He told the inquirers that he had to ponder on the origin of the false rumors. At length he "illuminated" the mind of the Communist workers many of whom ached to strike a resounding blow at the perpetrators of the malicious stories about Trotsky. "Forgetting" the Trio's machinations such as Kamenev's clause "correcting" Trotsky's report to the Twelfth Congress, Trotsky, without batting an eyelash, assured the workers that it was the Nepmen and the Kulaks who were spreading the lying rumors that he "underestimated" the peasantry! *(Ib.)*

6. *The Stalinist Character of the Moscow Opposition*

For several weeks after the publication of the Trio-Trotsky "New Course" Resolution, the Moscow Oppositionists and the Trio were

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

engaged in a debate in the pages of *Pravda*. In that large-scale performance the Preobrajensky-Sapronov leaders gave the impression of being a true opposition to the Stalin faction by introducing a separate resolution on Workers Democracy. But this seemingly dramatic and exciting move, fooling many revolutionary workers, was a sham because it did not call for the removal of Stalin: "Only a swift, unified and sincere fulfilment of the Resolution of the Politburo, specifically the renewal of the inner-Party apparatus through reelections, can guarantee our Party the transition to the New Course without disturbances and internal struggle and will strengthen the real unity of the Party ranks." *(Pravda,* Dec. 13, 1923)

Fundamentally Preobrajensky's resolution was a Stalinist document, an "Oppositional" prop to the Trio-Trotsky Resolution. In his speeches he went a step beyond the resolution and at the discussion meetings charged that the Party was ruled by a secret Triumvirate. This aroused Kamenev's ire: "Comrade Preobrajensky mentioned that we heard of some kind of a trio. (Preobrajensky: 'Comrade Stalin spoke of it'). I do not know what Comrade Stalin said, I know what you said here. I should like to ask Comrade Preobrajensky does he know of at least one political document, of at least one decision, one order issued by a trio? Does he know of any document where the policy of the Central Committee is not carried out in the name of the Central Committee?" *(Pravda,* Dec. 14, 1923)

During the altercations Preobrajensky in reference to the Twelfth Congress made a truly priceless disclosure, naturally lost in the maelstrom of phrases. His remarks were recorded in the Bolshevik press: "Comrade Stalin declared at the Party Congress that in his opinion the Congress expressed approval of the leading trio in the Politburo. What trio? The Party knows only the Central Committee and the Political Committee; the Party knows nothing of any trios." *(Pravda,* Dec. 16, 1923). Neither the Trio nor Trotsky nor any other leader refuted Preobrajensky's reference to Stalin's declaration at the Party Congress. The ugly picture of the Twelfth Congress and Trotsky's approval of the rule of the Trio thus becomes even more glaring.

That Preobrajensky and the Moscow Opposition he led were a *loyal opposition, an integral part of the Stalinist bureaucracy,* is further evident from the fact that he knew of the suppression of Lenin's writings but pretended no one knew *why* they were suppressed. He indicated that he was familiar with the contents of Lenin's letter to the Twelfth Congress: "Comrade Lenin in a letter, which, *we do not know why,* is even now not known to the Party, on the National Question, said that the worst possible thing one can allow himself in politics is to become angry." *(Pravda,* Jan. 20, 1924, Our emphasis—G. S.)

But Preobrajensky did not disclose the gist of Lenin's letter. Nor did this "oppositionist" raise the demand for its publication. Indelibly smeared with Stalinist tar, the leaders of the Moscow Opposition had

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a deep interest in concealing the whole story from the workers. The one absolute requirement for the top burocracy to keep the masses steeped in abysmal political darkness tied the Trio, Trotsky and Preobrajensky together in complete harmony.

7. *The Trio's Open Attack on Trotsky*

While the ferment in the Party expressed itself in a verbal storm which touched various sides of the issue of burocratism without hitting the core concealed by all the burocratic factions, the Trio under the cover of the discussion successfully brought the attack against Trotsky into the open. The method employed was to assert that Trotsky was linked with the Democratic Centralists, or the Moscow Opposition. However, not all the members of the Trio moved at an even pace. This presented one of the leaders of the Opposition, Sapronov, with an opportunity to point out the discrepancy in the tactics of Zinoviev and Kamenev: "Today it has been announced that the resolution in the Politburo was adopted unanimously. How is it then that one member of the Politburo charges another member of the Politburo with being a member of the fraction of the Democratic Centralism, while yet another member says that there is unanimity in the Politburo. Where is the logic of the members of the Politburo of the Central Committe? Comrade Kamenev in his report has established that the theses have been adopted unanimously. On the other hand, Comrade Zinoviev, member of the Politburo, is stating that Trotsky has entered the fraction of Democratic Centralism. Who is telling the truth, where is the truth?" *(Pravda,* Dec. 14, 1923)

Things began to move swiftly with the opening salvo against Trotsky by Stalin in *Pravda* of December 15, 1923. He accused Trotsky of duplicity. He argued that Trotsky, while posing as a defender of the Resolution on Party Building, had in reality, in his letter to the Party organizations a few days after the unanimous adoption of that Resolution, lent diplomatic support to the opposition:

"Is this the way to defend the Central Committee and its resolution on inner-party democracy, adopted, by the way, unanimously?

"Incidentally, Comrade Trotsky evidently did not even set before himself such a task when coming out with a letter to Party conferences. Evidently the intent here was different, namely: to render diplomatic support to the Opposition in its struggle with the Central Committee under the guise of defending the resolution of the Central Committee. This really explains the stamp of duplicity impressed on the letter of Comrade Trotsky. Comrade Trotsky is in a bloc with Democratic Centralism and partly with the Left Communists—this is the political meaning of Comrade Trotsky's utterings."

Steadily gaining momentum, the Trio's counterfeit issue soon became the focal point in the discussion. *Pravda, Izvestia* and other papers, lecturers and speakers throughout the length and breadth of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Bolshevik State snared millions of unsuspecting victims among the toiling masses. Trotsky's former disagreements with Bolshevism were dusted off and linked with his new "mistakes," with his "slandering" of the "old guard," his "inciting" of the youth "against" the old generation, his "tacit approval" of factionalism. The most envenomed assailants of Trotsky were Stalin's two partners in the Trio: "Zinoviev and Kamenev were the most embittered adversaries of mine during the time of the alliance with Stalin." (*The Case of Leon Trotsky*, 80).

While the Trio traced Trotsky's anti-Bolshevism many years back, it naturally "overlooked" Trotsky's current line against Lenin's policy for the liquidation of Stalin—no theoretical mistake on Trotsky's part. Like Trotsky, the Trio had to keep mum about everything that was connected with the dark deeds perpetrated by the entire body of leading burocrats headed by Stalin.

8. *Trotsky's Reaction to the Open Attack*

To most of Trotsky's friends, admirers and worshippers the attack came as a terrible shock. Hundreds of thousands of young and old Communist workers and Red Army soldiers, entertaining great esteem and deep affection for the most eminent leader next to Lenin, awaited with anxiety Trotsky's answer. Everybody knew that Trotsky had never groped for words. Everybody knew his extraordinary command of the pen. When he had thought himself right, he fought, whether the opponent was the Tsar, Kerensky or Lenin. Surely he would now come out and disprove all the false accusations. A few days after Stalin's open attack Trotsky made a statement in the press, but instead of a scathing indictment of Stalin and his partners in power, doubtless expected by thousands and millions, Trotsky wrote: "I do not reply to some specific articles appearing recently in *Pravda* since I regard that this is more conforming with the interests of the Party, and, especially, with the present discussion of the new course." (*Pravda*, Dec. 18, 1923)

Incredible? But viewing the matter from the angle of the dilemma Trotsky had got himself in, what other "positive" course was open to him? No doubt torn between the burning desire to slash out savagely against the perfidious Trio and the cold realization that the slightest intimation of an intrigue would be tantamount to suicide, Trotsky elected to remain silent—"Conforming with the interests of the party. . . ." Everybody understood the expression to mean the interests of the proletariat. But the interests of the proletariat certainly demanded that its internal foes, the burocratic directors of the Party be unmasked. Patently, Trotsky's excuse for not replying to the attack by Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others was demagogy to conceal his impotence in the face of their frame-up.

Upon examination of Trotsky's works there are to be found glaring discrepancies in his excuses for maintaining silence. In 1923,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as we have seen, his explanation was *political.* He refrained from replying to the attacks, he officially stated, because he considered his silence to be in the interests of the Party. But in his autobiography written in 1929 he creates the impression that illness prevented him from answering the Trio: "The 'Trio' could under no circumstances pit itself against me. It could pit against me only Lenin. But for this it was necessary that Lenin himself could no longer oppose the Trio. In other words, the success of its campaign required either a Lenin who was fatally ill, or his embalmed corpse in a mausoleum. But even this was not enough. It was necessary that I too be out of the ranks. And precisely this happened in the fall of 1923." *(My Life,* II, 234). There follow several pages describing a hunting trip during which Trotsky contracted influenza. The story concludes: "The doctors ordered me to stay in bed, and thus I spent the rest of the autumn and winter. This means that all through the discussion of 'Trotskyism' in 1923, I was ill."

An uninformed reader could not but conclude that had Trotsky been well he would have fought the Trio. But the fact is that during his illness, which commenced in October 1923, Trotsky was able to write and to speak. We know of the frequent meetings of the Politburo held in his apartment. He was pacing the floor, raging against the cold-blooded Trio. But his speeches he never released for publication. In December he wrote letters on the New Course, printed in *Pravda.* He penned the letter of "explanation," giving as his reason for silence not illness but *the interests of the Party.* It is obvious that the excuse of illness came later, as an afterthought.

To the letters published in December Trotsky added several articles, or chapters, and compiled the whole in a pamphlet bearing the title *The New Course* which was published by the State printing house in January 1924. The title lent strength to the deception that the Trio had actually launched a new course. The pamphlet did not contain even a remote allusion to the need of fighting the Trio. To prove to the Trio that the idea of reducing its influence was more alien to him than to anyone else, Trotsky printed a declaration of Communist Youth leaders who were supporting him, as an appendix to *The New Course:* "Nobody (and Trotsky less than anyone) has challenged the need of preserving the preponderant influence, the leadership, of the old cadre of the party. This need is more than obvious to all of us."

Preobrajensky and other leaders of the Moscow Opposition realized that no hope existed for reestablishing harmonious cooperation in the Central Commitee unless the Trio terminated its crusade against Trotsky. But instead of offering a forthright exposure of the intrigue, they actually furnished the Trio with a cover by terming the conspiracy a "mistake."! Preobrajensky said: "I consider it a basic error which the Politburo committed personally in relation to Com-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

rade Trotsky that it ill-treats Comrade Trotsky as a stranger in our midst. With such an attitude joint work is impossible." *(Pravda,* Jan. 20, 1924)

The Trio, of course, denied all charges about its attacks against Trotsky: "We are told: The Central Committee is hounding Comrade Trotsky; some kind of a trio sits there and is not pleased that Comrade Trotsky is with them. But this is not true. How can there be a serious discussion about it? This is just old women's gossip." (Kamenev, *Pravda,* Jan. 12, 1924)

But at the same time the Trio pressed forward.

9. *The First Victim of Trotsky's Silence*

Trotsky's position of standing united with the Trio in the Resolution of the Politburo on Party Building prevented him from uttering a single official word in support of the Moscow Opposition. Profitting immensely by his sorry contradiction, the Trio demanded from Trotsky plain speaking on the Opposition. Stalin declared that Trotsky, through his evasion to take a definite stand for or against the Moscow Opposition, behaved dishonestly:

"For the entire period of the discussion Comrade Trotsky conducted himself in a two-faced manner, rudely ignoring the will of the Party which desired to know his actual position, diplomatically evading the question which was presented point-blank by a whole number of organizations: Whom does, after all, Comrade Trotsky support, the Central Committee or the Opposition? The discussion is being conducted not for the purpose of evasions but in order plainly and honestly to make known the whole truth to the Party, as Ilyitch is capable of, as every Bolshevik is obligated to do. It is said that Comrade Trotsky is seriously ill. Let us allow that he is seriously ill. But in the course of his sickness he has written three articles and four new chapters of his pamphlet which has appeared today. Is it not obvious that Comrade Trotsky has had the full possibility to satisfy the organizations which have been inquiring of him and write two lines stating whether he is for the Opposition or against?" *(Pravda,* Jan. 20, 1924)

With malicious cynicism Stalin called on Trotsky to tell the whole truth to the Party. Naturally Trotsky recoiled from the challenge. On Trotsky's part silence regarding the fabricated stories about the danger of "Trotskyism" gave credence to the Trio's charge. By the same token Stalin was free to delude the Party membership with an impressive display of responsibility of the General Secretary ostensibly concerned with promoting healthy inner-Party relations. Moreover, Trotsky's inability to come out openly in support of the Moscow Opposition gave Stalin the golden chance to present Trotsky publicly and officially as one who feared to speak the truth to the Party.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky's silence performed another and far more important function for Stalin. The most advanced workers in the Party, looking for genuine anti-Stalin leaders, fell into the error of lending support to the loyal Stalinist "opposition" led by the "46." Witnessing the unscrupulous methods the leadership employed against Trotsky, these honest workers, imagining that the Party had actually entered upon a new course of freedom of expression, voiced their criticism of the Central Commitee. At this point Trotsky's silence, inexplicable to them as the Trio's conspiracy itself, allowed Stalin to drive them to their doom. "The Left Proletarian wing of the party . . ." writes Trotsky in *The Third International After Lenin,* "has been subjected, beginning with the Fall of 1923 to systematic, organizational campaigns of extermination." (160)

It must be kept in view that because the proletarian ranks in the Party were basically anti-burocratic, the Moscow Opposition secured the support of nearly half of the Party membership. In Moscow the "46" actually had a majority! "At the time of the Party discussion in the autumn of 1923, the Moscow organization was divided approximately in half, with a certain preponderance in favor of the Opposition in the beginning. However, the two halves were not of equal strength in their social [potential.] On the side of the Opposition was the youth and a considerable portion of the rank and file; but on the side of Stalin and the Central Committee were first of all the specially-trained and disciplined politicians who were most closely connected with the political machine of the General Secretary." *(Stalin,* 387)

The origin of Stalin's system of organizational extermination of the best workers in the Party was a direct result of Trotsky's concealment of the truth about Lenin's policy, his silence about the Trio's intrigue against himself and the consequent shying away from a clear statement on the Moscow Opposition which was under the hammer blows of the Stalin apparatus.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER V.

THE THIRTEENTH CONGRESS OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

1. *The "Leninist Levy"*

THE ADVANCED rank-and-file of the Bolshevik Party presented an extremely serious problem to the Stalinist burocracy. The best, most courageous workers gathered round the Opposition leaders, Preobrajensky, Sapronov and Smirnov; and because of the attack upon Trotsky these workers warmly sympathized with him. These subjectively anti-Stalin workers constituted a smoldering volcano rumbling menacingly beneath the burocratic crust. Both Stalin and Trotsky were quite aware of this. The Party burocracy could not proceed along any other road except the road of a deep political and physical change in the composition of the rank-and-file of the Party. This could only be accomplished by diluting the membership with a huge army of politically raw workers who would overbear the advanced by the sheer weight of numbers. The new recruits, limited in their understanding, entertaining profound respect for the Central Committee which suddenly let down the high political barriers and bestowed upon them the privilege of belonging to the ruling Party, would readily succumb to the wiles and chicanery of the "Old Guard." The recalcitrant Communist workers, on the other hand, through a sifting process, could be eventually eliminated from the Party altogether and dispersed by the administrative arm of the State.

Lenin's death provided Stalin with an exceptional pretext. On January 31, 1924, with an air of pretended sorrow, Stalin's Central Committee announced the launching of a Leninist recruiting drive. Trotsky later stated the essence of the maneuver:

"Availing itself of the death of Lenin, the ruling group announced a 'Leninist Levy.' The gates of the party, always carefully guarded, were now thrown wide open. Workers, clerks, petty officials, walked through in crowds. The political aim of this maneuver was to dissolve the revolutionary vanguard in raw human material, without experience, without independence, and yet with the old habit of submitting to the authorities. The scheme was successful. By freeing the burocracy from the control of the proletarian vanguard, the 'Leninist Levy' dealt a death blow to the party of Lenin. The machine had won the necessary independence." *(Revolution Betrayed,* 97-98)

To grasp more fully the import of the blow the Stalin leadership dealt to the anti-burocratic proletarian core of the Party through this "Leninist Levy," it suffices to point out the changes in the probationary conditions for accepting new members into the organization. The Central Committee bestowed upon the immense army of nearly a quarter of a million new recruits the immediate full right of membership: "To grant to all candidates for membership in the Russian Communist Party the right of decisive vote in the elections of delegates to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Thirteenth Congress." (Decision of the Plenum of the Central Committee, *Pravda,* April 2, 1924)

Pressing the large-scale operation with vigor, Stalin's flunkeys admitted that the decision of the Central Committee was at variance with the Party statutes. Yet they had no doubt that the Congress would approve this serious break with the established policy of recruitment of Party members: "This decision is not in accord with the Party statutes, which afford elective rights to Party members only. But there is no doubt whatsoever that the Congress will justify and confirm this decisive step in the direction of real workers democracy." *(Pravda,* April 3, 1924)

Crack propagandists armed with the sweeping authority of the Central Committee went out to put across the Leninist Levy in a veritable blizzard of revolutionary phrases. The keynote of the deception, as we have seen, was that this vast swindle was in actuality extending workers' democracy. A leader in the assault on Trotsky sugar-coated the maneuver with these words: "The Leninist levy is practical democracy, Bolshevik democracy in actuality . . . It is the most genuine, unadulterated, unsweetened democracy." (Zinoviev, *Pravda,* May 9, 1924)

2. *The Mensheviks on "Leninist Recruiting"*

Although doing an effective job of deceiving the broad strata of workers, the Stalin leadership was unable to fool everybody. To the Mensheviks, for example, the maneuver was obvious. Their Berlin paper wrote with biting sarcasm:

"These new recruits of the 'Leninist Levy' were looking on for twenty years, avoiding joining any party. But in the year 1924 since the birth of Christ, and in the 7th since the October Revolution, they 'arrived at the conviction' that they could not but become members of the Russian Communist Party! Even in the stormy years of 1917-1918, when every thinking worker adhered to some sort of a party, they remained stagnant. These are the passive elements existing within the working class of every country and through their passivity render support, up to a certain moment, to the dominant tendency. But that is precisely what the Zinovievist Central Committee requires . . . Because the chief task of the new 100,000 members is to secure and fortify the victory of the 'Trio' in its fight against the internal opposition." *(Sots. Vest.* March 8, 1924)

There was nothing profound in the explanation supplied by the Mensheviks. No thinking person with any knowledge of the inner relations among the leaders of the Soviet Union would have had to ponder over the Trio's stratagem.

On April 16, 1924, over a month after the Mensheviks had grasped the fact that the maneuver was "to secure and fortify the victory of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trio against the internal opposition," *Pravda* printed this piece of Stalinist propaganda:

"The demise of Ilyich created an entire transformation in the consciousness of hundreds of thousands of workers. When the working class reacts to the death of its leader in such a manner that Baku gives 9,500 new Party members—this is the highest democracy, highest voting; this is not parliamentary charlatanism, not parliamentary deception, but a genuine democratic workers' vote."

If outsiders, such as the Mensheviks, understood the essence of this deception, surely a man like Trotsky was fully conscious of it. But did he expose the nature of the above-cited words to the workers? Not at all! He had a good reason for letting those words stand and do their work—*he wrote them!*

It is relevant to observe that the Lenin line on membership was the direct opposite from the one carried out by Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Trotsky, Molotov and others. In March 1922, about two years back, Lenin had said: "I consider it extremely important to prolong the probation period for new members of the Party. Zinoviev fixes the probation period at six months for workers and twelve months for others. I propose that six months be allowed only for those workers who have actually been workers in large industrial enterprises for a period of not less than ten years. For all other workers a probation period of eighteen months should be fixed; two years should be fixed for peasants and Red Army men and three years for others . . . I think it is very dangerous to leave the short periods proposed by Zinoviev . . . it must be borne in mind that the temptation to join the government party at the present time is enormous." *(Sel. Wks.* IX, 320, 321-2)

And now the Stalin-Trotsky burocrats were enrolling hundreds of thousands of new members without a *single day of probation* and called it *Leninist* Recruiting!

3. *Regarding the Suppression of Lenin's Testament*

That Lenin addressed his Testament to the Twelfth Congress is fairly clear. How the Trio prevented the disclosure of the document at that time remains obscure. The Stenographic Report of the Twelfth Congress as well as of all the subsequent Congresses contain no reference to the Testament. From Stalin's speech at the October 1927 Plenum of the Central Committee it is clear that the suppression of the Testament occurred at a Congress, but which Congress Stalin did not state: "As to the publication of the 'testament,' the Congress decided not to publish it since it was addressed to the Congress and was not designated for the press." *(Pravda,* Nov. 2, 1927)

There remains Trotsky's testimony according to which the Testament was suppressed after Lenin's death, at the Thirteenth Congress. Perhaps Krupskaya, the first alleged custodian of the original document, had been persuaded to hold the Testament in abeyance on

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Stalin's promise to change his mode of behavior. At any rate the document was brought out before the high burocrats of the Party possibly at the Thirteenth Congress. Trotsky says: "After Lenin's death, not long before the Thirteenth Congress, she handed the Testament to the secretariat of the Central Committee, in order that through the Party Congress it should be brought to the attention of the Party for whom it was destined." *(Sup. Test.,* 12)

Krupskaya encountered a stern opposition from the Trio: "The trinity decisively expressed themselves against reading the testament at the congress—the motive not at all difficult to understand. Krupskaya insisted upon her wish. At this stage the dispute was going on behind the scenes." *(Ib.)*

At length Stalin resorted to a "democratic" maneuver. He made a pretense of letting the leaders of the delegations settle the dispute: "The question was transferred to a meeting of the seniors of the congress—that is, the leaders of the provincial delegations. It was here that the oppositional members of the Central Committee first learned about the testament, I among them." *(Ib.).* After Kamenev read the document aloud, the Trio played their "democratic" trump card:

"The trinity introduced, through one of its henchmen, a resolution previously agreed upon with the provincial leaders: the document should be read to each delegation separately in executive session; no one should dare to make notes; at the plenary session the testament must not be referred to. With the gentle insistence characteristic of her, Krupskaya argued that this was a direct violation of the will of Lenin, to whom you could not deny the right to bring his last advice to the attention of the party. But the members of the council of seniors, bound by factional discipline, remained obdurate: the resolution of the trinity was adopted by an overwhelming majority." (13)

We note several important points in Trotsky's testimony. The Trio directly violated Lenin's wish regarding the Testament and through the hand-picked henchmen passed the decision to hide the document from the Party membership. Krupskaya's part is very definitely indicated by Trotsky. But what of his own role in the circumstances? Around his position during the dispute between Lenin's widow and the Trio there hangs a thick fog. Due to the obscurity of this point, we must be guided by Trotsky's *deeds* preceding and following the Thirteenth Congress—deeds which bear directly on the suppression of Lenin's anti-Stalin documents. We have clearly established that over a year before, in April 1923, Trotsky sided with the Stalin clique in the Presdiium of the Twelfth Congress to suppress Lenin's letter on the National question. When the Thirteenth Congress convened in May 1924, Trotsky and Stalin were still united in the conspiracy to conceal that letter as well as the Testament.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *A Crass Burocratic Manipulation*

The day after the secret reading of Lenin's Testament, at the meeting of Seniors, the curtain was raised on the Thirteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party—the second Stalinist Congress. Nearly all the dignitaries of the Party apparatus were present. Trotsky, standing high among the burocrats, was "elected" by the Stalin gang to the Presidium of the Congress—*unanimously*. The demagogic performance was opened by Kamenev. Stating frankly that the decision to grant full membership rights to the recruits of the Leninist Levy was a "formal" violation of the Party statutes, Kamenev called upon the Congress to legalize the violation. Here we have a blatant piece of "legal" chicanery. The "delegates" who had received illegal support from the new recruits were now presented with the choice of approving the violation which aided them in being elected or condemning the violation and thereby invalidate their presence at the Congress! As the Trio expected they responded enthusiastically to Kamenev's obviously burocratic manipulation. He asked whether there was any discussion on this point. No one asked for the floor. Kamenev's remarks on this issue are of interest:

"Comrades, before going over to the work of the Congress, the Central Committee must submit to your discretion one of its decisions which requires your sanction. The Central Committee decided to grant the Party candidates the right to vote in the elections of the Thirteenth Party Congress. This is a formal violation of our statutes. But the Central Committee assumed that it reflected the general opinion of the Party when it granted our new comrades in the Party, members of the Leninist Levy, workers from the shops, the right to participate immediately in such responsible matters which are deciding the fate of the Party and the determining of the composition of the forthcoming Party Congress. However, in order that these elections should receive full legal power, the Congress must confirm this decision of the Central Committee. And so, I place for your vote, in accordance with the first point on the agenda, the confirmation of the decision of the Central Committee to grant the Leninist Levy and the Party candidates the right to vote in the elections to this Congress.

"Does any one desire to speak on this question? No. You wish to vote? Who is for the confirmation of this decision? The decision is accepted, as I see it, unanimously." (*Sten. Rep.* of the Thirteenth Congress of R. C. P. 13; *Pravda,* May 24, 1924)

Not a voice was raised against this blow at the anti-Stalin rank-and-file. Trotsky and the so-called "leaders of the Opposition" complied by silently accepting Stalin's policy of watering down the advanced element in the Party.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

5. *Trotsky Echoing Stalin on the Leninist Levy*

The ground felt firm under Stalin's feet. Wearing a "revolutionary" armor forged for him by Trotsky, an effective protection against the anti-burocratic workers in the Party, Stalin declared to the crowd of burocrats representing his own faction and the loyal Opposition that the Party was an *elective organ of the working class!* "Such facts as the discussion and the Leninist levy—there is no need proving this—are the major events in the country and in the Party, and they of course could not but enliven the inner life of the Party. What do these two facts reveal? They reveal that our Party, having lived through the discussion, is as strong as a rock. Also that our Party, having taken in 200 thousand new members in accordance with the will and approval of the entire working class, is in actuality an elective Party, an elective organ of the working class." *(Pravda,* May 27, 1924). Trotsky in his speech at the Thirteenth Congress simply echoed Stalin's lie on the Leninist Levy: "We are conducting the Thirteenth Congress in new circumstances and these circumstances are created by the Leninist Levy which transforms in a proletarian direction the social composition of the Party itself. Does this change or remove the problem of inner party democracy? No, it does not change, it does not remove the problem. Undoubtedly, the Leninist levy, *as has been correctly pointed out here,* has brought our Party nearer to being an elective Party. I spoke on this subject in Tiflis, I spoke about it in Baku, and at some meetings in Moscow." *(Ib.* Our emph.—G. S.)

The words we have emphasized show that Trotsky gave direct support to Stalin's demagogy. Stalin spoke at the evening session on May 24, Trotsky's speech came *after* Stalin's, on May 26.

When, twelve years later, Trotsky in *Revolution Betrayed* branded the Leninist Levy as a scheme for "freeing the burocracy from the control of the proletarian vanguard" and said that through this scheme "the machine had won the necessary independence," he omitted to mention his own part in foisting the Leninist Levy on the proletariat. As in all the other instances of his participation in Stalin's crimes against the masses, which in later periods he denounced with pretended bitterness to create the belief that he had fought Stalin, so in the case of the Leninist Levy Trotsky later felt fairly safe from exposure. He knew that to unearth his support to this machination one had to discover step by step his true role in the burocratic system, to hit the exact issues of *Pravda* in which he portrayed this Stalinist fraud as "the highest democracy" *(Pravda,* April 16, 1924) and then compare all that with the measure of truth he told about the Leninist Levy in his book *Revolution Betrayed.*

6. *Trotsky's Continued Silence Concerning the Testament*

The atmosphere at the Thirteenth Congress was far more putrid than at the Stalinist foundation congress a year back in April 1923.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Years after, Trotsky spoke of the Thirteenth Congress in the following terms: "The machine was already in complete control. The mere fact that the trinity was able to transgress the will of Lenin, refusing to read his letter at the congress, sufficiently characterizes the composition of the congress, and its atmosphere." *(Sup. Test.* 17). Under this "critical" surface is hidden the fact that Trotsky was an important component of the Congress, gracing the Presidium with his presence and contributing a major share to the atmosphere of this gathering. By his own admission, he had been present at the reading of the Testament, but withheld any reference to it on the floor of the Congress.

Trotsky's apologists attempt to explain that he acted under stress of "Party discipline." Paradoxically, the door to this "technical" escape is bolted by Trotsky himself in his explanation of what must be the attitude of a revolutionist toward Party discipline: "Because even in the Bolshevik Party, with its very severe discipline, Lenin first emphasized that the essence is more important than the form; that the ideas are more important than the discipline; that if it is a question of fundamental importance, we can break the vows of discipline without betraying our ideas." *(The Case* etc. 422-23)

No discipline on earth could have hindered a revolutionist from disclosing to the workers the least breach of revolutionary morals on the part of any leader, let alone a plot of a gang of crooks directed basically against the toilers. It was different with the *Stalinist* Trotsky, now the chief shield of the usurping General Secretary. With all his might and main Trotsky worked to safeguard the burocratic system. The existence of Lenin's Testament indicating a clear line for removing Stalin could be made public only when this revelation could no longer cause an explosion in the Russian Party and the Comintern. Three and a half years after the Thirteenth Congress, Stalin himself no longer feared to make an admission of the existence of Lenin's Testament and even revealed publicly the vital words concerning himself. In December 1932, Trotsky, long after he had been eliminated from the Russian Communist Party and the Comintern, wrote: "Lenin's letter, known under the name of his testament, has henceforward chiefly a *historic* interest." *(The Suppressed* etc. 41, Our emph. —G. S.) But it was not of merely a "historic" interest in the Spring of 1924, only four short months after Lenin's death. The eyes of all revolutionary workers in the Soviet Union and the world were focused upon the first Congress after Lenin's death, primarily upon Trotsky and Zinoviev who were regarded by the millions as the most outstanding Bolshevik leaders. On May 23, 1924, the day when the Congress officially convened, the American Stalinist paper, *The Daily Worker,* wrote: "The leadership of the Party will be of great moment to the Congress. Leon Trotsky, Commissar of War and the Red Army, and G. E. Zinoviev, President of the Leningrad Soviet and Chairman of the Communist International, are the two most *outstanding* figures of the Party in Russia."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

But the most polular man was not Zinoviev. It still was Trotsky. Had he suddenly released the bombshell about the suppression of Lenin's advice to remove Stalin, it would have caused a scandal in the Party and toppled the entire Stalinist structure. But free choice had forever passed from Trotsky's hands.

7. *Trotsky Importuned by a Friend*

Max Eastman, Trotsky's American friend, early supporter of the Bolshevik Revolution, was present at the Thirteenth Congress. Over sixteen years later Eastman revealed something about his talks with Trotsky "in a little nook behind the platform" where Trotsky had supplied him with information about Lenin's Testament. In Trotsky's official speech at the Congress Eastman discerned insincerity and observed that Trotsky was concealing the truth. Eastman pleaded with Trotsky to expose Stalin—but his plea was futile. Eastman even appealed to Trotsky in the name of the revolution—to no avail:

"It was certainly the most ill-judged speech I ever listened to. I had just been talking to him about his real opinions. In fact it was in a little nook behind the platform at that convention that he told me about Lenin's Testament, his last letter to the party, which Stalin had withheld from them and locked up in the safe. He quoted the main phrases for me to use. I was leaving Russia the next day, and we said goodbye.

" 'What are you going to do when you get home?' he asked.

" 'I'm not going to do anything except write books.'

" 'He smiled a deprecating smile and I added:

" 'I believe in the class struggle, but I love peace.'

" 'You love peace? You ought to be arrested,' he said.

" 'I agreed; and that was, it seemed, our farewell word. But right after that he got up and made this insincere, inept, inadequate—to my mind blunderingly stupid—speech. I could not refrain from going up and drawing him into our nook again and telling him what I thought he ought to do.

" 'In God's name,' I said, or words to that effect, 'Why don't you peel off your coat and roll up your sleeves and sail in and clean them up? Read the Testament yourself. Don't *let* Stalin lock it up. Expose the whole conspiracy. Expose it and attack it head on. It isn't your fight, it's the fight for the revolution. If you don't make it now, you'll never make it. It's your last chance.' He looked at me in some surprise. I had been on the whole a respectful biographer. He even weighed my advice seriously for a moment. Then he assumed a quizzical expressoin. 'I thought you said you loved peace,' he said." *(Foreign Affairs,* January 1941, 340-341)

No, Trotsky could not "expose the whole conspiracy"! He might have pretended to weigh Eastman's advice seriously, but he had no intention of committing political suicide by exposing *himself.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky's grotesque and cringing behavior was evident not only to his close friends and, naturally, to the Stalin crew, but even to sideline observers like the Mensheviks. They cited the sorry figure he cut at the Thirteenth Congress: "Isn't Trotsky's role at this Congress, for instance, quite touching? Delicately and diplomatically he defends himself against the accusers from the Party majority, bowing right and left before his enemies." *(Sots. Vest.* June 20, 1924)

8. *Trotsky's Allegiance to "the Party"*

Trotsky's speech at the Thirteenth Congress, as his friend Eastman readily perceived, was insincere, but Eastman was wrong calling it a "stupid speech." It was a clever oration designed to uphold the illusion that Stalin's Party was a proletarian-revolutionary organization. Trotsky was ecstatic in his devotion to "the Party" and his concluding words, although not without a touch of injury, were an outburst of allegiance to Stalin's discipline:

"Not only individual members of the Party, but even the Party itself may commit some specific errors; such for instance are the specific decisions of the last conference, which I consider in certain parts incorrect and unjust. But the Party cannot have such decisions, although incorrect and improper ones, which would shake even one iota of our unlimited devotion to the cause of the Party, the readiness of every one of us to bear on his shoulders the discipline of the Party *under all conditions.* And if the Party adopts a decision which one or another of us considers as unjust, still he will say: just or unjust, it is my Party and I bear the consequences of the decision to the end. (Applause.)" *(Pravda,* May 27, 1924. Our emph.—G. S.)

There could be no more effective support to the oppressive bureaucratic regime in the Party than Trotsky's impassioned acceptance of the decisions of the Trio under the guise of "the discipline of the Party"! The Stalin faction treated Trotsky's speech with utter contempt and showed it to be a diplomatic maneuver to make "peace with the Party." Zinoviev, in his report to the Leningrad Party organizations on the results of the Thirtenth Congress, said:

"The first word in reply to Comrade Trotsky's speech was said by our noted Leningrad comrade, Uglanov, now the Secretary of the Nijni-Novgorod Provincial Committee and a member of the Central Committee of the Party. Comrade Uglanov, voicing the feeling of the whole Congress, described Comrade Trotsky's utterances as a 'parliamentary speech.' 'At our Congresses,' he said, 'we have no use for parliamentary speeches; give us plain talk.' The attempt to come to terms with the Party was highly praiseworthy in itself, but it should not be attempted in this manner. One cannot come to terms with the Party by offering it a large dose of sweetened water, but one may come to terms by stating the question plainly, by finding out where the mis-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

takes were made and how they are to be rectified." (*Inprecor*, June 26, 1924, 370)

Trotsky dared not state the question plainly; and how well Zinoviev and Uglanov and all the other leaders, both in the Stalin and in the Trotsky faction, knew it.

9. *The Ignominious Opposition*

While Trotsky maintained his pretence of not being directly connected with the Preobrajensky faction, even though the Trio had long since identified him as its head, the "opposition" leaders at the Thirteenth Congress kept up the appearance of critics of Stalin. And in doing so they were impelled to allow a peep into the darkened interior of the Party—something Trotsky avoided doing. Preobrajensky in his speech threw a ray of light on the recent purge or "cleansing" by the Stalin machine:

"Now allow me to say something with full frankness regarding the current Party cleansing. Comrades, it would have been much better if this cleansing were conducted by a decree to cleanse the Party of a definite section of oppositional elements. Then everyone who was subjected to expulsion for precisely that would leave the Party not like a person disgraced politically and morally. He would have been expelled for being in opposition. He would probably hope, and I think not without a basis, that someday he would return to the ranks of our Party. He would have been leaving not as a 'careerist,' not as a 'self-seeker,' a 'brawler' etc.

"This purge is being carried out (this can be statistically established) in the overwhelming majority of organizations which supported the resolutions of the opposition. (Voices: What organizations?) Concerning the positive side of this cleansing, in the sense of uncovering abuse, that is fully welcomed by all, and no one argues against it. But I speak of the political purge. The cleansing of which you speak must always be carried out, it was and always will be carried out and the Party will always welcome it. I speak of a cleansing as a specific method of struggle against the opposition, as a method of struggle for the past activity. It would be better to pose the question definitely and clearly. But at the present time we see that those committees which carry out this cleansing, while obligated by the decision of the Central Control Commission not to purge for oppositionism, at the same time frequently purge for being in the opposition. And thus we are faced with the following situation: the committees are compelled formally to expell comrades for something they are really not guilty of. (Voices: 'Facts!') As many facts as you wish. I'll tell them to Yaroslavsky. And so, I consider that this *mistake* is injurious to our Party, it is injurious in the sense that this whole operation was carried out before the Congress, that it brought the situation to such a point, that a number of members of our Party thanks to this procedure lost the possibility to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

discuss freely all the questions prior to the Party Congress." *(Sten. Rep.* 202-203. *Pravda,* May 28, 1924. Our emph.—G. S.)

This was testimony of a leader of the Opposition. He pointed clearly to a wave of frame-up expulsions of advanced anti-Stalin workers who were being replaced with the backward or opportunist recruits of the Leninist Levy. However, attention must be called to the *basic* policy of Preobrajensky. He loyally preserved the vital secrets of the Stalinist conspiracy, and while unveiling a pitifully limited portion of the Trio's machinations, he termed as a "mistake" its crime of transforming honest, anti-burocratic workers into political and social outcasts.

Under Trotsky's influence, Preobrajensky abandoned the verbally bold stand he had assumed during the autumn of 1923. At that time he had stated: "In my opinion, the Party already for two years has been conducting a fundamentally incorrect line in its internal policy." *(Pravda,* November 28, 1923). That was a big statement even though no policy to remove Stalin was propounded. But now, at the Thirteenth Congress, Preobrajensky, assiduously avoiding anything like a showdown, *approved* Stalin's policy as *correct!* And by employing the pronoun "our" he identified himself with the Stalin Trio: "The workingclass manifests confidence on the basis of our policy. Our policy has been *correct* in general and on the whole; our international policy and our internal policy in relation to the other classes of our country has been correct. The working class places confidence in the general line of our policy by entering our Party." *(Sten. Rep.* 196: *Pravda,* May 28, 1924)

Thus the Moscow Opposition despite its "criticism" drew a deceptive film over the basic policy of Russian nationalism and the burocratic corruption of the Party and the State, also over the specific maneuver of the Trio to dilute the Party membership through the Leninist Levy. The leaders of the Moscow Opposition were "doctors" of a peculiar sort: they were spreading, instead of fighting the malady.

10. *Stalin's Withering Attack*

The speeches of Stalin and his allies at the Thirteenth Congress formed a merciless fusillade against Trotsky and the leaders of the Opposition. Stalin spoke with the conviction that he was unassailable. And in truth he was, for at the Twelfth Congress (April, 1923) *all* the leaders had become hopelessly entangled with him. Conscious of the fact, Stalin in his concluding remarks at the Congress taunted the crouching Opposition: "We all demanded and do demand facts which would show the degeneration of the cadres. Yet, such facts were not produced before us, and it is impossible to produce them because such facts do not exist in nature." *(Pravda,* May 28, 1924). Trotsky and the leaders of the Opposition naturally kept their lips sealed.

With the Moscow Opposition Stalin had a sure and easy way. He

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

made Preobrajensky an object of ridicule: "If Comrade Preobrajensky said: 'In general and on the whole the international and internal policy of the Central Committee was correct,' then it must be noted that this part of his speech was not particularly parliamentary and skillfull. (Laughter). Insofar as I know, besides the international and internal policy there is no other. (Laughter). It turns out that in general we carried out the international and internal policy correctly. And therefore he began one of his articles of the discussion period by writing: 'The basic line of the Party on the inner Party building and the inner Party policy for the period of the NEP has been incorrect." *(S. R.* 266. *Pravda,* May 28, 1924). Thus the basic inconsistency of the "opposition" was cleverly brought out by the General Secretary.

Stalin's henchmen delighted the audience by demonstrating the ludicrous contradictions of the Moscow Opposition and made sport of Trotsky's "diplomatic" approach. Kamenev attacked Trotsky unmercifully, pointing out that neither during the discussion on "The New Course" nor at the Thirteenth Congress did Trotsky make definite his attitude towards the Moscow Opposition. Never dreaming of the terrible fate the Stalin rule had in store for him, Kamenev pressed Stalin's line:

"And indeed, what agitated the Party more than anything else, what caused the Party to toss in fever and intensified the crisis? It was that the Party awaited the answer to the question, what is Comrade Trotsky's attitude to the line of the Opposition, on the emergence of the Opposition, on that ideology which was unfolded by Comrades Preobrajensky, Osinsky, Sapronov, Drobnis and others. What is Comrade Trotsky's attitude to all this? Comrade Trotsky at that time kept mum; he has kept mum in today's speech as well. Nothing was said by him about this. There was a detailed story of his attitude to the Resolution of December 5th, which he signed, which is good, and about which we do not argue now. But the question which agitated the Party, which created this hectic condition—you all remember how the Party awaited to hear what Comrade Trotsky would say in connection with the emergence of the Opposition—he at that time and now treated the question with silence . . . Not only did Comrade Trotsky become ill but the entire Party was ill, by the way, because Comrade Trotsky found it necessary, possible, and tactful to keep mum about his relation to this Opposition which, only because it based itself on his name, had the possibility to agitate the Party." *(Pravda,* May 28, 1924)

If at the Twelfth Congress, Trotsky, though towering above all the other burocrats as the most exalted personality, had descended to the level of Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev and instead of delivering the principal address, reported on industry, now he was no longer their near-equal. The Stalin faction deprived him of the prestige of reporting on *any* question. He was merely one of the minor speakers who discussed the main reports. Although at the conclusion of the Congress

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Trio circumspectly "reelected" him to the Central Committee and to the Politburo, Trotsky was well on his way towards disgrace and ruin.

CHAPTER VI.

THE 1923 BETRAYAL OF THE PROLETARIAT

1. *The Proletarian and Bourgeois Dangers to Russian Burocracy*

THE STALIN SCHEMERS learned from Marx, Engels and Lenin that when the back of the world capitalist system is broken the proletarian State begins withering away. As Lenin indicated, with revolution sweeping on from country to country the revolutionary center would automatically shift from relatively backward Russia to some advanced country, in all probability to Germany, France or England. In consequence, Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and the other Russian burocrats would no longer enjoy the position of hegemony. Lenin said in his work *The Third International, Its Place in History*: "For a time—it goes without saying it is only for a short time—hegemony in the revolutionary, proletarian International has passed to the Russians . . ." It was imperative for the seekers of permanent burocratic control of the Russian State to organize matters so that as long as they did not possess a first-rate, highly centralized war machine that could advance beyond the borders of the former Tsarist Empire and establish their direct or indirect military-police control over the masses in new territories, the Comintern leadership had to check the risings of the proletariat abroad. In doing this they faced an inescapable consequence. This policy would temporarily safeguard the bourgeois powers and therefore would immensely increase the peril of their attack upon Russia. But since the Russian leaders were consumed by the passion of personal power they could pursue no other policy. That was a contradiction they could not resolve.

In carrying out their carefully devised plan through the sections of the Comintern, the Trio was thrice fortunate. To begin with, Zinoviev was strategically situated, being the chairman of the Comintern. The leading elements of the German, French, American and other section of the Comintern were opportunists hailing in the main from the old Second International. The substance of Zinoviev's method was to reward the office-hungry opportunists with positions of authority and honor. The qualifications required for eligibility to leadership in the sections of the Comintern can readily be guessed. The people whom the Russian burocrats would help climb into posts of leadership had to stand above the workers in education, had to have to their credit some experience in misleading the masses, had to be familiar

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin, endowed with oratorical ability or be craftsmen with the pen. Unwavering support to the heads of the Russian Party was the "modest" price they were required to pay in return for the conferred favors.

In large numbers the place-seekers took advantage of the alluring opportunities and obligingly followed the policies designed to ward off the proletarian and the imperialist dangers to the Russian burocracy.

2. *The "Workers Government" Trap*

In their policy to divert the proletariat from the path that might lead to the democratic proletarian power in the countries not under their military control, the Russian burocrats had set themselves a far less difficult task than it would seem. Of superior ability, they had gone through tremendous political experience and knew what tactics could lead to the overthrow of the bourgeois State and what tactics could disrupt the struggle of the workers. All that had to be done was to hand down to the eagerly observant puppets in the Comintern a policy running to the Left or to the Right of the policy which Lenin had applied in Russia in 1917. Armed with a Left or a Right policy, the Comintern could lead the rebellious workers either upon the Scylla of Leftism or the Charibdis of Rightism and thus frustrate any attempt to set up a distant regime which might not submit to the Moscow center.

Any regime based on capitalist industry is a capitalist regime. Such a regime may be headed by a monarch, a military dictator, a president, it may be formed by a party calling itself "Labor," "Socialist," "National Socialist," but its class character remains *bourgeois,* since it is founded on bourgeois private economy. Often when the bourgeoisie faces a proletarian upheaval it resorts to a government bearing the label "Socialist," "Labor," or some other similar "working class" name. Such a government is pictured before the confused revolutionary workers as a middle-of-the-way government supposedly leading toward a genuine proletarian regime and to the abolition of Capitalism, and therefore warranting the workers' support. Intrinsically a trap, the "middle" line inevitably spells disaster to the masses and restoration of the stability of capitalist rule and exploitation. This fact was known to the Bolsheviks. "Every middle line will lead to the domination of the bourgeoisie . . . " (Lenin, *Works, XVI,* 1923 R. 266)

On November 10, 1922, at the third session of the Fourth Congress of the Comintern Zinoviev laid down before the delegates a middle line thesis described as "Workers Government." The workers were told that after the temporary expedient of "support to the non-Communist workers' government" or to a Socialist-Communist coalition, it would be possible to pass on, as over a bridge, to the higher and final stage of the class conflict for power and establish an authentic proletarian State. That the Trio's chief vocal exponent of this ultra-Right

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

line at the Fourth Congress found support in the future leaders of the Trotsky Opposition is a matter of record. As Trotsky himself later showed: "In the Bolshevik Party differences arose *after* the first four congresses of the Comintern whose decisions were elaborated with the most direct participation of the future leaders of the 'the Left Opposition.'" (*New International,* Oct. 1939, 301, Trotsky's emphasis)

The Fourth Congress was held in November-December 1922, five months before the "united" Twelfth Congress. The "differences" between the Trio and Trotsky, as we remember, arose in the Autumn of 1923. Therefore from Trotsky's statement above it is fairly obvious that he took part in fashioning the Rightist "Workers Government" trap, and the following statement is an added proof of his participation: "All the programmatic manifestoes of the four Congresses were written by me." (*The Case,* 25)

3. *The German Communist Party Leadership*

As in other sections of the Comintern, the German leadership was split up into warring factions. The Brandler-Thalheimer faction, in control of the Party for nearly three years, was regarded with particular favor by the Stalin Trio. They were honored to the extent that plants in Russia were named after them. (*Krasnaya Gazeta,* Nov. 7, 1922). No sooner had the Workers Government device been officially sanctioned than Brandler and Thalheimer introduced it to the German Communist workers. These leaders clearly understood that the slogan Workers Government was *not* synonymous with the Workers State. The Rightist device was not put in operation immediately. As a prerequisite, the proletarian vanguard had to be rendered as lifeless politically as possible. Its 1923 tempestuous mood therefore was systematically dulled. To top it all, the Comintern Executive Committee through Radek, its authoritative representative and a supporter of Trotsky, ventured to advocate unity with the Nazis and integrated Nazi ideology into the German Communist ranks. A description of this attempt is given in a Trotsky magazine:

"But the most hopeless floundering was in the ranks of the Communist Party. With its adventuristic soul it swam in the wake of the chauvinist Nazi propaganda; with its bureaucratic 'ministerial' soul it adapted itself to the sterile, negative limited anti-fascism of the Social Democracy. There was hardly a phase of German politics into which the Communist Party did not project itself, even into that of the particularism of the provincial governments. Brandler and Co. made Saxony and Thuringia the center of their politics instead of Berlin. Confusion reached its height when in Moscow, Radek glorified the anti-Semitic soldier, Schlageter . . . Radek's speech aroused frantic applause. In Germany it was the basis of a series of fraternal actions between the Communists and the Nazis. Communist firms published brochures in which Communist and Nazi statements appeared alongside each other." (Held, *Fourth International,* Jan. 1943, 24)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Springing the Trap*

Conditions in Germany came to a boiling point in October, 1923. Following some desultory action of the hard-pressed masses amidst wide-spread unemployment and the frenzy of inflation, hunger-riots swept the country. In many provinces the situation was slipping from the control of the authorities. To the Russian chiefs it was plain that the moment had arrived to employ to the fullest extent the line of the Fourth Congress. The German puppet leaders were summoned to Moscow and given directives, as reported in an American Comintern paper: "Two trusted German Communists, Heinrich Brandler and August Thalheimer are in Moscow discussing the situation with the officials of the Communist International." (*The Worker,* U.S.A. Oct. 6, 1923). The instruction Brandler received was that he and other leaders were immediately to enter the Social Democratic government of Saxony. Because that government based itself upon the bourgeois Landtag, such action by the Communist leaders, to whom the workers now anxiously looked for guidance, would keep the masses chained to the capitalist State. "On October 12, 1923, three German Communists, Heckert, Brandler and Bottcher, entered as a minority into a coalition Landtag government in the province of Saxony together with the Left socialists, headed by Minister Zeigner. Participation in such a government, the first of its kind in the history of the Comintern, was *categorically* advocated in a telegram to the Germans *from the Executive Committee in Moscow.*" (*Third Int. After Lenin,* "Explanatory notes," 323, Our emph.-G.S.). About a week after the Saxon Social Democrats took Brandler and his aides into their Cabinet, another Workers Government was set up in Thuringia, with two Stalinists, Korsch and Temner, participating.

The dominant figures in the Comintern and in the Soviet Union had for some time impressed upon the workers the delusion that there was a basic distinction between the Left and Right Social-Democrats. The Right Social Democrats, the Comintern leaders granted, were incorrigibly traitorous. But the Left Socialist leaders, according to this, could be expected to support the proletariat under certain conditions. Such a premise, the Stalinists had explained, made a coalition with the Left Social-Democrats feasible.

During the eventful days in Germany in the Autumn of 1923 an impression was fostered that the Left Social-Democrats of Saxony, in whose Cabinet Brandler accepted a ministerial post, were carrying out a policy to which the Right Socialists were opposed. As a matter of fact, the Left Social Democrats carried out the policy of the Right. This fact was known in the high circles in the Russian Communist Party. Two innocent-looking items appeared in different issues of *Izvestia.* When placed side by side they tell the story:

"True, the Saxon Committee of the Social-Democratic Party, as well as the Social-Democratic fraction of the Saxon Landtag are composed of a majority of Right Social Democrats." (*Izvestia,* Oct. 16,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1923). "The decision to form a Social-Democratic-Communist government in Saxony was adopted *unanimously* by the Saxon Committee of the Social Democratic Party." (Statement by Graupe, Saxon Minister of Labor, *Izvestia*, Oct. 18, 1923)

More! Two Ministers in the Saxon Workers Government were Right Social Democrats: Liebman, Minister of Interior, and Noy of Justice. The coalition government in Saxony was composed not "of Communists and Left Social Democrats" but of Stalinists and Left and *Right* Social-Democrats!

Since the threat of a proletarian explosion hung over Germany, the Social-Democrats, Right and Left, saw the opportunity to strangle the revolution by working with Brandler. So well did the German Social-Democrats evaluate the policy of the Brandler leadership that they even broached the subject of organic unity with the Communist Party. (*Pravda*, Oct. 9, 1923)

While the Workers Government was systematically frustrating the masses by its inaction, the bourgeois leaders were feverishly preparing to take control of the situation and replace the Socialist-Stalinist Coalition Cabinet with a stable capitalist regime. The sabotaging policy of the Workers Government gave the bourgeois generals the necessary time to prepare for action.

Many German revolutionary workers were manifesting disappointment with the Workers Government. The Communist Minister of Finance, Bottcher, had to urge them to put up with it, though, by his own admission, it was unable to conduct a workers' policy! "The formation of the Workers Government, declared Bottcher, makes it easier for the proletariat to struggle for power; but until there will take place the shift of class forces, the Workers Government is unable to carry on a workers policy." (*Pravda*, Oct. 24, 1923)

As to the position of the leaders of the German Communist Party on the question of the overthrow of the bourgeois parliamentary regime, as the Bolsheviks had done in Russia, some light was shed in the significant statement by a loyal supporter of the bourgeoisie, Thuringian Prime Minister Froelich: "Asked about the Communists in the Coalition Government Herr Froelich said the Communists had surprised him by unequivocally accepting a parliamentary and constitutional government." (*N.Y.T.* Oct. 22, 1923)

Meanwhile the Comintern press was pouring sheerest deception into the mind of the revolutionary workers. "Saxony stands guard for the revolution," lied *Pravda* of October 20, 1923. "And the left Socialist-Communist government in Saxony is the nucleus of the future Soviet government of Germany." lied *The Worker* of October 27, 1923. In the same issue of *The Worker* one meets with this brazen tale: "In Red Saxony and Thuringia the workers rule." The Stalinist writers embellished their fabrications with numerous fictitious details. Typical is the following bundle of "optimistic" deception printed in a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

magazine edited by Wm. Z. Foster, one of the early place-seekers in the American section of the Comintern:

"A mighty Communist party is rising up from the seed sown by the old Spartacists; and the workers, in ever-growing masses, are following it... The German proletariat holds the fate of the world proletariat in its hands. This time it will not fail." (*The Labor Herald,* Nov. 1923, 29)

Plagued by the Comintern and by Social Democracy, the German proletariat was held back from striking at its class enemy. This left the bourgeoisie a free hand to act. Bourgeois General Muller, whom the Social Democratic Stalinist Workers Government had retained in his post, advanced with troops upon the virtually unarmed Saxon workers and after a brief action broke their resistance. In the process of stabilizing the situation the Landtag discarded the Workers Government and set up an outspokenly pro-capitalist Social-Democratic-Center coalition.

5. *The "Hamburg Putsch": a Leftist Cover*

Although the workers of Saxony and Thuringia suffered a sharp setback, the revolutionary spirit of the German workers could not be effectively broken without a defeat in open battle. So the Brandler flunkeys of the Moscow Trio steered the revolutionary workers upon the rocks of ultra-Leftism. While General Muller busied himself with stabilizing capitalist law and order in Saxony and Thuringia, about three hundred deceived Communist workers staged a rising in Hamburg on the 24 of October, 1923. The minor "putsch" was organized behind the back of the masses of the city; even most of the Communist workers were not prepared for this adventure. It was easily put down by the armed forces of the bourgeois State. This gave an impetus to a general repression of the workers of Germany. Brandler's superior, Zinoviev, later shamelessly greeted the criminal ultra-Leftist follow up to the Rightist line with assumed enthusiasm: "Hamburg constitutes an entire programme for the German and for the international proletariat." (*Inprecorr,* Oct. 29, 1924)

After the Stalinist-provoked defeat in Hamburg, the atmosphere within the proletariat of Germany began to undergo a rapid change toward apathy and resignation. The immediate proletarian danger to the Russian burocracy had passed.

6. *Samples of the Scapegoat System in the Comintern*

When the enthusiasm for the Workers Governments of Saxony and Thuringia had given way among the revolutionary workers everywhere to bitter disappointment which in many instances was mixed with a strong suspicion of opportunism in the high "advisory" councils of the Comintern, Zinoviev, by degrees, shifted the blame for the betrayal upon his erstwhile stooges, Brandler and Thalheimer, who were

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

branded as "Rights." As a result of the Russian wire-pulling, the Brandler-Thalheimer leadership was removed: "In 1924 we definitively gave our consent to remove the Right group, agreeing that power should be transferred into the hands of the Left—Ruth Fischer and Maslow." (Zinoviev at the Fourteenth Congress of the R.C.P. Dec. 1925). Concurrently, the German Lefts, who had previously incurred pronounced disfavor of the Moscow burocrats for having rejected the policy of Workers Government now received an honorable mention from Zinoviev. Pointing to a striking resurgence of strength of Social Democracy in Saxony and Thuringia, he wrote: "This is a new and important confirmation of the fact that the 'Saxon policy' of Comrade Brandler's group was opportunistic and wrong and that the left majority of the German Communist Party, *with the Comintern,* were absolutely right when they condemned and repudiated this policy." (*Inprecor,* May 15, 1924, 284. Our emph.-G.S.)

The Left group, very flattered, closed its eyes to Zinoviev's self-shielding lying remark "with the Comintern." Had Ruth Fischer and Maslow felt strongly about facts, they could have recalled a few recent statements by Zinoviev which would have been extremely embarrassing to "the Comintern." For instance, Zinoviev had declared in an article dated November 2, 1923: "Certain comrades are of the opinion that the tactics of the German Communist Party in Saxony were mistaken. 'Saxony was a great and perhaps fatal error,' so writes an old comrade from Germany. Is this diagnosis correct? No it is not. Those who observed the situation in Germany solely through Saxon spectacles, were naturally guilty of provincialism and distorted perspective." (*Communist Inter.* Dec. 1923, 4)

But in addition to the German and international aspects of the Trio's task of absolving itself of the consequences of the Workers Government policy, there was also a Russian side. Eventually, Zinoviev laid the blame for the coalition line in Saxony on Trotsky and on Trotsky's supporter Radek: "Radek and Trotsky urged on us a policy of coalition with the Social Democrats, to a policy of agreements and coalition with Menshevism." (*Ib.* June 1925, 80)

Brandler was never returned to power in the German Communist Party and eventually was driven out of the Comintern altogether. The system of theoretical frame-ups, originating in the burocratic milieu of the Bolshevik State, received its application also in the Comintern.

7. *Trotsky's Share in the Betrayal*

As a result of the growing crisis in Germany early in the Autumn of 1923 the Russian workers were tense with expectation. The Trio was constrained to call meetings and conduct demonstrations at which exciting pictures were painted of the mounting success of the German workers. The speakers filled the atmosphere with confidence in the German Stalinist Party. The Russian workers were led to imagine that parades and speeches in Russia would aid the German prole-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tariat. "In 1923 huge demonstrations and meetings were held in the Soviet Union to support the German proletarian revolution, on the order of the day at that time." (*Militant,* Nov. 10, 1934)

Trotsky too addressed the workers' gatherings. Lauding the establishment of the Workers Government in Saxony and Thuringia, he spared no effort in regaling the workers with glowing forecasts. In a speech before the metal workers of the Moscow District, Trotsky skillfully concealed the bourgeois character of the sabotaging Workers Governments. His speech was reported in *Pravda* and *Izvestia* for October 21, 1923. It was reprinted in the December 1, 1923 issue of the American Stalinist weekly, *The Worker,* from which we quote:

"At the present time the situation is *clear.* The coalition of the Communists with the Social Democrats in the government of Saxony and Thuringia is comparable to the coalition of the Communists and Left Social Revolutionaries in Russia. Generally speaking the development of the movement grows all the time. Those working masses which are still clinging to the Social Democrats are growing impatient and are ready to leave their leaders. Events are developing as if according to a plan. If *all* the signs of the struggle do not deceive us *we may* expect that in the *near* future power will go over into the hands of the working class." (Our emph.—G.S.)

Only a day before Trotsky's speech was published *Pravda* had carried information as to the political composition of the Saxon Landtag, the parliamentary body on whose decisions the Workers Government rested. There were ten Stalinists, forty Social Democrats, nineteen Nationalists Fascists, nineteen of the Right-bourgeois People's Party and eight Democrats. Support to the Socialist-Stalinist coalition Workers Government was secured by a bare *three* votes! This parliamentary show Trotsky compared to the government of the Bolshevik State formed by Lenin and himself in 1917! Trotsky said it could be expected that power would pass into the hands of the German working class. This was an indirect admission that Saxony was not in the power of the workers but remained part of the capitalist State of Germany.

Without question there were thousands of workers in Russia whose political perception had not been completely dulled by their burocratic leaders. But if they suspected any danger to the German proletariat, Trotsky's reassurences dispelled all doubts. In Germany, said Trotsky, "Events are developing as if according to a plan." What more could a revolutionary worker wish!

To lull suspicion, Trotsky, like the other Stalinist burocrats, injected a note of vigorous optimism about the Communist Party of Germany: "The question is: this Party is still young. Will it find in itself the will to effect the revolution, will it be able to accomplish this? *In this respect* circumstances favor the working class of Germany. The workers are ready for struggle, and in order to act they must know that at their head stands a party *ready to lead them* from struggle

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to struggle and to *final victory*." (*Izvestia*, Oct. 21, 1923, *The Worker*, Dec. 1, 1923. Our emph.—G.S.)

Did Trotsky really regard Brandler and his cohorts as men to lead a proletarian revolution? Not at all! Their opportunism had been dramatically displayed precisely within the Social Democratic Workers Government. On October 19, 1923, exactly two days *before* Trotsky's speech to the metal workers was reported in the press, *Izvestia* had printed the news that the Brandler leaders assumed the responsibilities to the bourgeois Landtag, clearly indicating that they led the German workers along the path of ruin: "Communist Minister Bottcher declared that he is responsible not to the military command but *only* to the Landtag." (Our emph.—G.S.)

Even prior to the concrete exhibiton of their opportunist essence Trotsky knew that the heads of the German Party were a danger to the proletariat. Early in the Autumn of 1923, as we remember, Trotsky became alarmed at the insidious attack on his prestige and power. He was impelled to give notice to Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev that they would meet resistance should they persist in their designs. But Trotsky was already ensnared in the tentacles of the monster he had helped to create. His threats therefore could only be idle gestures. One of these gestures, made behind the scenes, was his criticism of the Brandler leadership of the German Communist Party. On the eve of the October events in Germany he told the Stalin Central Committee, a hotbed of intrigue against him, that the Brandler leadership was worthless and declared that the German revolution would end in disaster. We quote from Trotsky's work *The Third International After Lenin* where Trotsky cites his statement as recorded in the documents of the Central Committee:

". . . Comrade Trotsky, before leaving the session of the Central Committee [September 1923 Plenum], made a speech which profoundly disturbed all the members of the Central Committee and in which he alleged that the *leadership of the German Communist Party was worthless* and that the Central Committee of the German C.P. was *permeated* with fatalism, sleepy-headedness, etc. Comrade Trotsky then declared that the German revolution was *doomed to failure*." (94. Our emph.—G.S.)

One can readily observe that in Trotsky's *actual* opinion the German Communist Party leadership was worthless and the revolution was definitely doomed. A few short weeks after his speech at the September 1923 Plenum of the Stalin Central Committee, the prophesy he had made was fulfilled.

Trotsky's behind-the-scenes evaluation of the Brandler leadership as well as his accurate forecast of the ruin of the German revolution were not a case of sudden foresight. One gathers this from Trotsky's remark on page 95 of *The Third International After Lenin*. He speaks of "my warning, which was *not the* first one," indicating that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the true state of affairs in the German C.P. leadership had been quite obvious to him long before the climax.

But was Trotsky's outburst before the burocratic auditors really an attempt, at least within the walls of Stalin's Central Committee, to oppose the Trio's choice of the Brandler leadership? He says on page 95 that his warning "was dictated only by concern over the fate of the German revolution". One may judge Trotsky's true intent regarding Brandler and the revolution by reading what he says further down on the same page: "Of course, I did not propose hastily to replace Brandler's Central Committee by some other (on the eve of decisive events such a change would have been sheerest adventurism)..."

Lest the notion be entertained that a change in the specific personnel in the German leadership might have altered matters for the workers, it must be emphasized that since the directing strings were pulled by the Russian burocrats, the revolution in Germany would have been equally betrayed with any shift in the tops of the German Communist Party. It is not altogether unlikely that Trotsky made the empty fuss about the Brandler leadership with an eye to a future escape from responsibility. At any rate, after the consummation of the betrayal and the removal of Brandler, Trotsky found a new way of playing "opposition" on the Brandler issue: "After the frightful collapse of the German revolution of 1923, I gave Brandler a qualified protection; I declared it undeserved to put him up as a scapegoat when the responsibility for the catastrophe in Germany lay with the Zinoviev-Stalin leadership of the Comintern as a whole." (*Militant*, Aug. 15, 1929, 6). If Trotsky protected Brandler against the Stalinist frame-up action, no worker in the Comintern ever knew about it. The scapegoat system would have been exposed had Trotsky revealed the purpose behind the Stalin-Zinoviev attack on Brandler. But while asserting in 1929 that the responsibility for the German debacle rested on the Stalin faction, Trotsky manifested the usual "forgetfulness" about *his own role* in the betrayal.

8. *Some Fiction About Trotsky's Role*

Since the facts of the Stalinist betrayal of the German revolutionary situation of 1923 have receded in time, the manufacturers of synthetic versions of history have been producing some captivating fairy tales concerning that period. When an investigator blows away the dust from the original records, he reads in *Pravda* of October 21, 1923 a reference to the speech Trotsky made to the Moscow metal workers in support of the Workers Government trap: "By the example of the coalition of the Communists with the Left SRs in Russia, Comrade Trotsky proves the correctness of the entry of the Communists of Saxony into the coalition government." The record is authentic, it is in cold print, it is irrefutable.

But when one scrutinizes the literature of the Trotsky movement, one finds a story as impressive as it is false: "In the meantime the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

leadership of the German party had made further blunders against which Lenin and Trotsky had expressly warned them at the Fourth World Congress 1922—they entered the Social-Democratic governments in Saxony and Thuringia." (Held, *Fourth International,* Jan. 1943)

Overzealous to shield Trotsky in order to perpetuate their political enterprise bearing his name, the Trotsky leaders, less skilled than he, often came forward with exceedingly clumsy fabrications. That their distortions are consciously-devised can easily be established. Max Shachtman, formerly a high-ranking official in the American Trotskyist camp, lecturer, "historian," and editor of Trotsky's selected works, in his pamphlet *Ten Years—History and Principles of the Left Opposition* published in 1933, cites a letter Stalin wrote to Zinoviev and Bukharin in which, in rather cautious phrases, the top Russian burocrat indicated that he definitely favored prevention of revolution in Germany. Stalin's words as quoted in *Ten Years* are: "In my estimation the Germans should be restrained, not spurred on." (20). In the same work Shachtman admits: "The policy pursued by the party leaders in Germany was not peculiar to Brandler and Thalheimer. It was derived from the leadership of the Communist International and the Russian Communist party . . ." (19). Yet all this knowledge of facts does not keep Shachtman from spinning the following: "In 1923, when the German revolution was expected, the Soviet Republic stood at attention to aid it. The harbor of Petrograd was filled with grain ships ready to sail for Stettin so that the German Soviet republic would not be starved out by the Entente. Representatives of the Comintern and the Russian Party were active on German soil, preparing for the uprising as best they could under the leadership of Brandler and Zinoviev." (*New Int.* Jan. 1938, 11)

The fact is that during the momentous year of 1923 the Stalin burocrats were shipping grain not to the German workers but to the bourgeoisie to prop up its tottering government. In January 1924 the Stalinist commercial representative in Germany reported: "Germany, as is known, is the biggest purchaser of our rye. The Torgpredstvo of the U.S.S.R. in Berlin sold in 1923 over seventy million puds of grain, a considerable part of which was secured at the instruction of the German government." (Stomianikov, Report of Torgpred of USSR in Germany, *Pravda,* Jan. 3, 1924)

Thus, through simple maneuvers, the Russian betrayers held back the workers in Germany politically and forced the starving German masses to their knees before the German exploiters. In 1905 the German and Austrian bankers had come to the Tsar's aid with financial assistance and indirectly aided him in defeating the 1905 revolution. In 1923 the Stalin regime rushed political and material aid to German capitalism.

The Trio's policy strengthening the capitalist government of Germany was well known to Trotsky because it was clearly revealed in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the official press two months before the Twelfth Congress through a friendly advice to the German capitalists: "Only a closer economic and political contact with Russia will strengthen the position of the present German Government." (*Pravda,* Jan. 11, 1923)

CHAPTER VII.

THE FIFTH CONGRESS OF THE COMINTERN

1. *The Great Orator Speechless*

On the 17th of June, 1924, in the presence of five thousand workers, soldiers, sailors and young Communists, the Trio's political clerk, Kolarov, bearing the imposing title of "General Secretary of the Communist International" stated: "I hereby declare the Fifth World Congress of the Communist International open. (Stormy applause). The International is sung. At this juncture Comrade Trotsky appeared on the tribune, and was greeted by a stormy ovation from all sides." (*Inprecor,* June 27, 1924)

Despite the ovation Trotsky sat tight-lipped at the Fifth Congress. He remained mute even on the Russian question which was uppermost in the minds of millions of Communist workers. When the Russian delegation—Stalin, Zinoviev, Bukharin and others—announced officially that they agreed to have a representative of the Russian Opposition express its point of view, Trotsky, who was working with the Preobrajensky group under cover, refused to speak: "Despite the Comintern's invitation by the consent of the delegation of the Russian Communist Party, that the representatives of the Opposition inside the Russian Communist Party present and expound its point of view to the Congress, they refused, under a formal pretext, to take the floor." (*Pravda,* July 22, 1924).

Trotsky later revealed in one of his speeches that the Fifth Congress even condemned him for refusing to speak: "In the declaration of the Central Committee it was recalled that at the Fifth Congress, I, in spite of even a direct offer, refused to speak for the reason that the Thirteenth Congress had already expressed its opinion on the then disputed questions. Comrades, I must however remind you in connection with this the fact that the Fifth Congress in its declaration censured me precisely for my refusal to take the floor. In that declaration it was said that I excused myself on formal grounds instead of appearing before the highest body of the International to present my point of view." (*Pravda,* Dec. 14, 1926, VII Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International)

2. *Trotsky Embellishes the Burocrats before the Russian Workers*

While refusing to speak on the floor, Trotsky more than once

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

addressed the Russian workers outside the Congress. To them he pictured the Stalinist Comintern agents as the best revolutionary fighters: "In Moscow there now convenes—and we take pride in it—the Congress of the Communist International. To us come the best fighters of the whole world to learn—and there is something to learn in the school of Lenin." (*Pravda,* July 10, 1924)

Trotsky's studied silence at the Congress impressively reinforced this sentiment. Had these workers known of Lenin's suppressed documents and of the Trio's personal intrigue against Trotsky they would have naturally wondered why he withheld these important facts from "the best fighters of the whole world." But if there were isolated rumors reaching down into the Opposition ranks about the concealed writings of Lenin, these rumors were scotched by Trotsky's assurance to the workers that: "You have now the possibility to read everything that Lenin wrote. I advise you—it is very useful—to underline in these books particularly those places where he paid attention to the masses, what the mass wants, what it needs, not only what it wants but what it did not learn yet to want." (*Ib.*)

3. *The Manifesto of the Fifth Congress*

No document of the Fifth Congress reached such a high degree of demagogy as the "Manifesto of the Comintern to the World Proletariat on the Occasion of the Tenth Anniversary of the Imperialist war." Nearly every sentence contained a snare for the workers. While Stalin's apparatus was expanding and becoming a huge burocratic pyramid, the Manifesto assured the world proletariat that the Russian masses were constructing a Socialist society:

"Look at Russia: in this backward country spread out over immeasurable space, the revolutionary Party, created by the genius of Lenin, was not only able to overthrow its bourgeoisie but also to defend the power of the toilers against their numerous enemies. In the midst of tremendous difficulties caused by the backwardness of the country, low cultural level, monstrous devastation as a result of two consecutive wars, the workers and peasants are erecting brick by brick the structure of Socialist society." (*Pravda,* July 6, 1924)

Beyond question when Stalin affixed his signature to this document he was keenly aware that his steadily consolidating power was well guarded by Trotsky. Zinoviev, when signing the Manifesto, recognized in that document a potent ideological weapon in the Stalinist cause. Other Stalin burocrats signed it. *Trotsky signed it.* Nay, Trotsky was more than one of the signers of the Manifesto—he *wrote it.* Some years later the authorship of the Manifesto was unguardedly disclosed by Trotsky himself: "At the Fifth World Congress (1924) *I wrote* the manifesto on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the imperialist war." (*Stalin School,* 162. Our emph.—G.S.)

Trotsky faithfully integrated into the Manifesto the Leftist and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Rightist features of the Fifth Congress. There was the distinctly pronounced Leftist line characterizing Menshevism and Fascism as cousins. There was the clearly defined Rightist aspect, the call to the peasants of the world to repose their faith in a new Stalinist organization called the Krestintern—The Peasant International—set up by the Trio at the height of the Rightist line in October, 1923. Writing to Rakovsky in 1928 Trotsky branded the Krestintern as "Right Yeast.": "Zinoviev's ultra-Left course sprang from the Right yeast—struggle against the industrializers, romance with Raditsch, La Follette, the Krestintern, the Kuomintang, etc." (*My Life,* II, R. 304). But in the Manifesto, selling to the workers and peasants both Zinoviev's ultra-Left policy and the "Right yeast," Trotsky wrote: "And you, plundered and oppressed peasants, adhere to our great union. The Krestintern, created last year, fully and completely contributes its energies to the struggle against militarism and danger of new war." Reeking with hypocricy, Trotsky's Manifesto assured the masses that: "The Communist International serves the cause of the proletariat by telling it the truth. Let this truth ring everywhere like a tocsin of revolutionary struggle."

CHAPTER VIII.

TROTSKY'S OVERTURE TO STALIN

1. *A New Idea Dawns on Trotsky*

From the day the Trio had definitely shattered its personal collaboration with Trotsky and placed him under a stigma, Trotsky must have been desperately seeking a method by which he could extricate himself from the disastrous situation. In the Summer of 1924 he evidently thought he found a method of splitting Stalin away from Zinoviev and Kamenev and of winning him to the idea of a Stalin-Trotsky alliance. He was to blacken Zinoviev and Kamenev in the eyes of the workers, making it embarrassing for Stalin to continue in a bloc with them. Since it would have been suicidal to unmask Zinoviev and Kamenev in their immediate crimes, Trotsky resorted to the same technique they were employing against him. He raked up their old, forgotten disagreements with Lenin.

The scheme required a suitable literary vehicle which would permit him to bring out Zinoviev's and Kamenev's fight against Lenin with a hint that their present politics were wrong. He titled his work the *Lessons of October.* The work was palmed off as a study of the reason for the failure of the "German October," in the light of the Russian October. It purported to teach the proletariat how to avoid the repetition of the catastrophe of 1923. In reality the *Lessons of October* concealed the Comintern's betrayal of the German workers.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The policy of Workers Government and the participation of the leaders of the Communist Party of Germany in the Social-Democratic governments of Saxony and Thuringia were not even mentioned. About Trotsky's own support to the Socialist-Brandler coalition, his comparing the Socialist-Brandler Landtag government to the Bolshevik government established in 1917 in Russia, about his secret statement in Stalin's Central Committee evaluating the German leadership as worthless and the revolution as doomed, and about the opposite evaluation he gave to the metal workers of Moscow—there was not a syllable.

But if the book contained not even a pretense of analysis of the Comintern line in Germany it certainly abounded in references to the conflict between Lenin and Zinoviev and Kamenev back in 1917. Describing Zinoviev and Kamenev as Rights, Trotsky quoted passages from their letter "On the Current Situation" in which they had warned the workers against Lenin's policy of seizing power.

On the other hand, Stalin's anti-Lenin line in 1917 prior to Lenin's return to Russia from Switzerland was not touched upon by Trotsky in the *Lessons of October*. The knowledge about that policy of Stalin's was widespread among the Bolshevik leaders in 1924. Stalin himself saw no point in concealing the fact. In a speech at the Communist Section of the Central Trade Union Council, on November 19, 1924, he stated:

"This was an entirely mistaken policy; for it produced pacifist illusions, supplied water to the mills of social patrioitism and rendered the revolutionary education of the masses difficult. This mistaken attitude I shared at that time with other members of the party, and I only renounced it altogether in the middle of April after I had subscribed to Lenin's theses." (*Leninism or Trotskyism*, by Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev, 32.)

Of course, years later the Stalin historians concealed the truth and even wrote so as to induce the false belief that Stalin prior to the arrival of Lenin followed Lenin's policy while others vacillated: "Stalin, who had just returned from exile, Molotov and others, together with the majority of the Party, upheld a policy of no-confidence in the Privisional Government, opposed the partisans of the war, and called for an active struggle for peace, a struggle against the imperialist war. Some of the Party workers vacillated, which was a manifestation of their political backwardness, a consequence of long years of imprisonment or exile. The absence of the leader of the Party, Lenin, was felt." (*History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, 183). "Stalin, returning from exile in the beginning of the Revolution, took charge of *Pravda* and defended Lenin's line in a merciless struggle against Kamenev . . ." (*Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXXVI, 362)

In the *Lessons of October* Trotsky, playing up to Stalin, maintained silence about Stalin's early 1917 policy, and only long after did he make a public reference to that policy. Thus: "The independent

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

position of Stalin (prior to the arrival of Lenin) at the beginning of the February revolution was opportunist through and through." (*Stalin School*, 86-87)

"Kamenev and Stalin occupied a common position at the beginning of the revolution: they supplemented each other." (Trotsky, *History of the Russ. Rev.*, I, 289)

As a member of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party in 1917 Trotsky knew that on the eve of the Bolshevik Revolution Stalin had rendered support to Zinoviev and Kamenev against Lenin:

"It thus became known that Stalin personally and alone—against the other member of the editorial board and a majority of the Central Committee—supported Kamenev and Zinoviev at the most critical moment, four days before the beginning of the insurrection, with a sympathetic declaration. The indignation at this was great." (III, 163)

Yet in the *Lessons of October*, while dealing Zinoviev and Kamenev resounding blows, Trotsky maintained a conspicuous silence about the most important member of the Trio. More, he kept Stalin's name out of the book in which he supposedly subjected the situation in the Bolshevik Party in 1917 to a serious political analysis. Stalin could hardly have failed to grasp the implication of the omission when his colleagues Zinoviev and Kamenev were openly named and attacked.

2. *The Subterfuge Fails*

But Trotsky's overture to Stalin rested on illusion. The ideological cornerstone of Stalin's structure was "anti-Trotskyism." To make a change now would have invited disaster to his steadily stabilizing power. It was only logical for him to reject flatly and definitely Trotsky's subtle bid for an alliance.

That the *Lesson of October* was really a factional document can be further gleaned from the fact that a number of Trotsky's supporters viewed it as such, and when a "literary discussion" against Trotsky crashed upon their heads, they adjudged its publication a *tactical error*. (*Supp. Test.* 42)

In the Fall of 1924, immediately upon the publication of the *Lessons of October*, the Trio opened the "literary discussion" utilizing Trotsky's book as a springboard. This was the second major offensive against "Trotskyism."

Trotsky's empty hope to win Stalin from Zinoviev and Kamenev was shattered. The outburst reverberated throughout the sections of the Comintern, and all the bribed leaders fulminated about the menace of "Trotskyism."

Throughout the ordeal Trotsky maintained an unbroken silence. At the turn of the year the "literary discussion" subsided. Aided by Trotsky's silence, which seemingly implied that the attack upon him was not unwarranted, Stalin had won another impressive victory, his invincibility became more pronounced and his crown of power rested

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

more securely. Trotsky's friends and supporters, particularly among the Opposition workers, were shocked by the Trio's persecution of their hero. They waited in endless suspense for Trotsky's reply to his calumniators. Finally after some months of silence, Trotsky came out with an excuse for not fighting the Trio:

"I have considered and I consider that I could have brought into the discussion sufficiently weighty principled and factual counter-arguments against the accusation that I pursue the goal of 'revising Leninism' and 'belittling' (!) the role of Lenin. I have refrained, however from explaining not only because I was ill, but also because in the state of the present discussion, every utterance of mine on that theme, regardless of its character, tone and content, would serve only as a stimulus to deepen the polemic, transform it from a one-sided into a two-sided polemic, and to give it a still more bitter character.

"And at the present time, evaluating the whole course of the discussion and notwithstanding the fact that there have been advanced against me a multitude of false and actually monstrous accusations, I think that my silence has been correct from the standpoint of the general interests of the Party." (Trotsky's letter to the Central Committee, *Pravda,* Jan. 20, 1925; Max Eastman, *Since Lenin Died,* 155)

3. *Trotsky and the Trio Again Violate Lenin's Testament*

This sordid chapter of personal power-politics, disguised on one side by the publication of a book pretending to clarify the workers on the debacle in Germany and on the other side by the new outbreak of "anti-Trotskyism" was not without a grimly humorous side. Zinoviev and Kamenev had at their disposal a clean and weighty argument against Trotsky. Had it been put forward, it would have conclusively established Trotsky as a factional intriguer. There would have been no two opinions, even among the Opposition workers. Beyond question Trotsky would have been universally condemned among the revolutionary workers for concentrating his fire upon the acts Zinoviev and Kamenev had committed seven years earlier on the eve of the October 1917 insurrection. This strong argument was contained in Lenin's Testament: "I will only remind you that the October episode of Zinoviev and Kamenev was not, of course, accidental, but that it ought as little *to be used against them as the non-Bolshevism of Trotsky.*" (Our emph.—G.S.)

But Zinoviev and Kamenev could not make use of Lenin's request because they were implicated in the suppression of Lenin's Testament. They were therefore compelled to resort to lies and misrepresentations in fighting Trotsky. But in Trotsky's case the irony of fate was bitter and cruel indeed. He too had at his disposal the very same statement of Lenin in which it was plainly indicated that no attacks should be levelled at Trotsky for his former disagreements with Bolshevism. Yet although subjected by the Trio to a violent attack, he could not resort to this fair weapon against them, for he was party to the suppression

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Lenin's Testament. Truly history plays strange pranks with the opportunists.

The Menshevik enemies of Bolshevism observed the depravity of the burocratic directors of the Russian State with exultation. Entertained particularly by Trotsky's political decay, the old Menshevik F. Dan, using contemptuous language suitable to the occasion, wrote in an article "The End of Trotsky":

"Why, indeed, do the Bolsheviks need to arrest, or even more, to kill Trotsky, when he wisely contrived to terminate his political life through the most miserable suicide? And it is precisely in such a way that he terminated it. There is something infinitely absurd, ludicrous and humiliating in the fact that a man like Trotsky, with such an enviable energy and talent, who performed such a colossal role in establishing the Bolshevik dictatorship, is set upon in 'the final and decisive conflict' by the insignificant, giftless 'Trio'—and with success —on the ground of spurious positions of literary chicanery with respect to the 'history of October.' " (*Sots. Vest.* Dec. 1, 1924)

Dan recognised that for some reason Trotsky did not want to fight his intellectual inferiors:

"Of course, Trotsky is a much bigger figure than those who 'defeated' him, Zinoviev and Kamenev. But if these shabby clowns 'defeated' him then it is the fault of Trotsky himself who could not or did not wish to start a struggle with the dictators on a level above their shabbiness. The 'hero' of October in the most comical manner tumbled headlong into a mud-hole of personal squabbling. And it is the comical, as is well-known, that kills.

"Whether Trotsky will be able to get up from that hole is at least doubtful. As it stands he is finished. This is already obvious from that 'daring' with which he is being kicked today by all kinds of Communist jackasses." (*Ib.*)

Such was the contemporary comment of gloating foes of both Trotsky and the Trio!

CHAPTER IX.

TROTSKY RELINQUISHES HIS WAR POST

1. *Trotsky's Persistent Popularity*

THE STRONGEST pillar of State power is the army. Unless those at the head of the State machinery enjoy full support of the army their power is not complete, and is often insecure. During critical periods, those who are in control of the army usually play the decisive role.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Almost from the birth of the Bolshevik State, Trotsky stood at the head of its armed forces. Despite the Trio's maneuvers, Trotsky was still far more popular among the Red Army soldiers than Stalin, Zinoviev or Kamenev. Trotsky was the man who had not only organized the October insurrection but also the Red Army. Because of this, for a long time Trotsky's prestige remained unimpaired by his political discreditment. But apart from this, Trotsky gained in prestige and sympathy with a large section of the masses and especially with the youth because he was the chief target of the ruling bureacracy and was mistaken for the champion of proletarian democracy. The Menshevik reporter noted Trotsky's "oppositional" popularity:

"Yet, Trotsky, who is being openly blotted out and strangled, enjoys at present a wide popularity among the youth, in the Communist section of the Red Army and even among the men-in-the-street. He is greeted with ovations. People stand in lines through the night, as though for a Shaliapin performance, in order to get into the hall to hear Trotsky. It is not a matter of sympathy for his views *(he has no definite platform of any sort)* but of the fact that Trotsky is in the opposition. Trotsky is being wiped out and stifled by the universally hated Trio—Zinoviev, Stalin and Kamenev." (*Ib.* Our emph.—G.S.)

Naturally, had Trotsky at the Twelfth Congress carried out Lenin's line, his strategic post of War Commissar could have been employed with material effect in rallying the proletariat to smash the Stalinist ring of conspirators. But when Trotsky joined the Stalin gang he automatically brought the Red Army under Stalin's indirect control by acting as Stalin's subordinate. Stalin, however, required direct and personal control of the Red Army, for until he secured this he could never hope to gain complete personal control of the State.

Since the opposition masses were not aware of Trotsky's line to safeguard the ruling clique, his task of paralyzing the anti-Stalin forces was far more delicate in the Army than in the Party. The solidification of a military opposition would have constituted a serious threat to Stalin's apparatus. Consequently, Trotsky's only safe procedure in the Army was to stifle all oppositional activity and to set a personal example by keeping Party politics out of the War Department: "After Lenin was taken ill, when the intrigue of the epigones began to penetrate into the War Department, I refrained from discussing Party matters, particularly with the military functionaries." (*My Life,* II, 254)

Trotsky had to concoct excuses for this seemingly foolish tactic. He later said he had held aloof from Oppositionists in the Army because they were subordinate in rank: "Putna . . . belonged to the Left Opposition. In view of the fact that he was a subordinate, I never spoke with him on the question of the Opposition." (*The Case,* 225). Naturally, everybody was a subordinate to Trotsky in the Red Army.

Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev methodically weeded Trotsky's friends out of the War Department. The removals were of ominous

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

significance to Trotsky, yet he had no choice but to continue screening the Trio's designs.

2. *Trotsky Accomodates Stalin*

But if the removal of Trotsky's intimate associates in the Red Army was a simple matter, it was quite different when it came to removing Trotsky himself. If Trotsky had uttered the slightest protest, his removal would have caused keen resentment among the broad masses. In 1924-1925 Stalin could not yet lie to the world proletariat that Trotsky had become a Fascist. Nor could he charge Trotsky with inefficiency, since Trotsky was admittedly one of the most able men in the Soviet Union. Stalin could easily achieve his aim if Trotsky *himself* gave up the post of War Commissar.

Trotsky knew that the ruling clique had to cope with the powerful traditions which were closely linked with his name. But as in every other difficulty faced by Stalin, here too Trotsky rendered him valuable assistance. Not only did Trotsky avoid revealing that the Trio's efforts to oust him from the post of War Commissar were a part of the intrigue against him, *but he gave up the post without offering even sham resistance.* Nay, if one is to believe him, he turned over the strategic position to Stalin with a feeling of relief: "Together with the traditions of the October overthrow, the epigones feared most the traditions of the civil war and my connection with the Army. I yielded the military post *without a fight, even with a sense of relief,* since I was thereby wresting from my opponents' hands *their weapon of insinuation* concerning my military intentions." (*My Life,* II, 261. Our emph.—G.S.)

Covering his act with the pretense that he was wresting from the ruling clique its "weapon of insinuation" Trotsky turned over to Stalin the military weapon of the State—a significant milestone in Trotsky's political and moral decay and in Stalin's rise to personal absolutism.

Stalin had to make the elimination of Trotsky acceptable to the revolutionary workers and Red Army men. And who could more effectively facilitate the clearing of Stalin's path than Trotsky himself! Writing for workers' consumption, Trotsky in his letter of resignation "explained" that the *interests of the cause* demanded his speedy removal: "There is no special need to prove that after the last discussion the *interests of the cause* demand that I be speedily relieved of the duties of Chairman of Revolutionary Military Council." (*Pravda,* Jan. 20, 1925)

Trotsky's statement is somewhat paradoxical. He tried to make the workers believe that he was acting in the cause of the proletariat. Insofar as the cause of the masses was concerned the removal of Trotsky was absolutely imperative—but not by *Stalin!*

Of profound significance is a statement by Lenin which Trotsky reported in his autobiography. It appears that Lenin, led to think that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky really aimed to destroy the Stalin faction, suggested that Trotsky stick to military work. Apparently anticipating an attempt at resistance on the part of the Stalin faction, Lenin thought it might be well to impress Stalin with a military threat in the process of liquidating the General Secretary's power: " 'Yes, our burocratism is something monstrous,' Lenin said. 'I was appalled when I returned to work. But just because of this you should not, in my opinion, become drawn into any departmental work besides the military.' " (II, 215-216)

In asking to be removed from his strategic post, Trotsky conveyed the impression that Stalin and his henchmen were the true dispensers of revolutionary justice; that it was right and necessary to dismiss from the State and Party institutions those whom the Trio adjudged politically unsound.

Trotsky's request to be removed from the post of War Commissar accomplished a two-fold task for the Stalin clique. Besides clearing away a great obstacle, it provided Stalin with vindication in dismissing Oppositionists from State institutions for having raised their voice against the "Leninist Central Committee" during the discussion of "Trotskyism." Not a few unknown anti-Stalin workers were driven out to perish of hunger, and some at their own hands. The ruling clique eagerly seized upon Trotsky's valuable assistance. Immediately upon his resignation, the Central Committee adopted a wordy resolution on Trotsky which, among other things, said the following:

"In view of the fact that the leadership of the army is unthinkable without full support to this leadership by the authority of the party, and that without such support there develops the danger of undermining the iron discipline in the army, and that the conference of Political Functionaries on the one hand and the fraction of the Revolutionary-Military Soviet of the U.S.S.R. on the other already expressed themselves in favor of removing Comrade Trotsky from military work, and finally in view of the fact that Comrade Trotsky himself in his January 15, 1925 declaration to the Central Committee recognized that 'the interests of the cause demand the immediate freeing' of Comrade Trotsky from 'the duties as chairman of the Revolutionary Military Soviet'—to consider the further work of Comrade Trotsky in the R.M.S. of the U.S.S.R. impossible." (*Pravda*, Jan. 20, 1925)

Trotsky was absent from this plenum of the Central Committee, owing, as he explained, to illness, thus obviating the possible embarrassment to the Trio and their cohorts as well as to himself in this ticklish business.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER X.

TROTSKY SEEKING A "POLITICAL VACATION"

1. *New Assignments by Stalin*

In his letter relinquishing the post of War Commissar, Trotsky placed himself unconditionally at Stalin's disposal. This momentous submission Trotsky brought to the attention of the workers through the Stalinist press: "As to the assertions frequently repeated in the course of the discussion that I aim at some 'special position' in the Party, do not submit to discipline, decline this or that work assigned to me by the Central Committee, etc.,—I, without entering into an analysis of these assertions, categorically declare: I am ready to fulfil any work whatsoever assigned to me by the Central Committee, in whatever post or without any post at all, and, it goes without saying, under any conditions whatever of Party control." (*Pravda*, Jan. 20, 1925)

The paralyzing effect Trotsky's statement produced among the Opposition workers can well be understood. To the Stalin clique he adequately indicated that he would be quite content with a very small portion of the burocratic loot of power. The days when Stalin had feared and pampered Trotsky, the days prior to and during the Twelfth Congress, had passed never to return.

There was only one reason why Stalin did not finish Trotsky organizationally and administratively with one blow. He was in dread of the advanced workers in the Soviet Union and the Comintern. True, the anti-Trotsky drive influenced the backward pro-Stalin workers to a great degree, but not yet enough to have Trotsky expelled even from the Politburo, let alone from the Party. Caution and patience were among the most outstanding attributes of Stalin's factional policy. At each succeeding stage Stalin would call a brief halt at a point beyond which it would be hazardous to venture. After Trotsky offered himself as a humble servant, Stalin gave the impression that the danger of "Trotskyism" had been successfully checked. Since Trotsky himself had left the matter of selecting his work entirely to the burocrats in power they did not take the trouble to consult him but made the selection behind his back. He was given work in the economic field, away from the center of the political life of the Soviet Union. In the eyes of the masses, Stalin and his henchmen, now occupying the entire political stage and all the strategic posts in the State, loomed larger than ever. To the deluded Opposition workers Trotsky's new situation, which almost completely cut him off from the Party rank-and-file, was galling. They, of course, were far from realizing that in the last few years Trotsky had been consciously working for Stalin. As Trotsky later admitted, he was moved by a sincere desire to put into practice the pledge of unreserved obedience he gave to Stalin: "In May 1925 I was made chairman of the Concessions Committee, head of the electro-technical management and chairman of the scientific-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

technical administration of industry. These three domains were in no way connected. Their selection was made behind my back and determined by certain specific considerations: *to isolate me from the Party,* to overwhelm me with current work, to put me under special control, and so on. *Nevertheless I made an honest attempt to work under new arrangements.*" (*My Life,* II, 261. Our emph.—G.S.)

Although everything was pointing pitilessly to the political and organizational exit of Trotsky, the man clung to the hope that he would at least be permitted to play the part of a despised beggar at a feast.

2. *The Continued Drive Against Trotsky*

Imagining that he hit upon the solution to his dilemma, Trotsky plunged into a scientific study of chemistry and technology: "When I began my work in these three institutions, unfamiliar to me, I plunged in up to my ears. I was specially interested in the institutes of technical science which, due to the centralized character of industry, had developed on quite a large scale. I assiduously visited many laboratories, watched experiments with immense interest, listened to explanations given by the foremost scientists, in my spare hours studied text-books on chemistry and hydro-dynamics, and felt that I was half-administrator and half-student. Not for nothing had I planned in my youth to take university courses in physics and mathematics. *I was as though taking a rest from politics* by concentrating on questions of natural science and technology." (II, 261-2. Our emph.—G.S.)

No sooner had Trotsky plunged into economic work than he discovered that for him there was no escape from Stalin's talons.

History was exacting a heavy price from Trotsky:

"The Stalin apparatus followed on my heels. Every practical step I took was used as a pretext for a complicated intrigue behind the scenes; every theoretical conclusion fed the ignorant myth of 'Trotskyism.' . . . It is no exaggeration to say that much of the creative activity of Stalin and of his assistant Molotov was directed toward organizing direct sabotage around me. It became almost an impossible task for the institutions under my direction to obtain the necessary means. People working in them feared for their futures, or at least for their careers. *My attempt to conquer a political vacation for myself was patently a failure.*" (II, 263. Our emph.—G.S.)

Let no one, however, be fooled by Trotsky's tale of a "political vacation." *At no time,* from his early youth when he had entered the political arena and up to his last day, did Trotsky take any holiday from politics. During his so-called "political holiday" which extended from the end of 1924 to the middle of 1926 Trotsky, as will be shown, did much *political* work for the Stalinist Order.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XI.

TROTSKY STAMPS OUT A SPARK OF ANTI-STALIN EXPOSURE

1. *The Testament and the Stalinist Conspiracy Revealed*

THE INTRIGUE against Trotsky would have continued undisturbed had it not been for a spark of exposure quite unexpectedly struck outside the Soviet Union in 1925. The Stalinist burocracy passed a few trying moments, but with Trotsky's aid emerged unscathed from a serious peril.

Max Eastman ignited this threatening spark. When Eastman was in the Soviet Union he had come in close contact with the leaders of the Party. Witnessing the unscrupulous attack against Trotsky, he knew that something was rotten in the Kremlin. He succeeded in learning a few secrets. No longer could he doubt that Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and other leaders were not the revolutionary saints they were depicted to be by the Comintern press. Possibly under the illusion that the Opposition actually intended in some manner to oppose Stalin, he was somewhat puzzled by Trotsky's "strange" behavior in the face of the hounding and slander. Years after, Trotsky from his exile in Alma Ata wrote an interesting letter dated September 11, 1928, to an Opposition leader, Muralov. In this letter Trotsky stated that "Eastman held to the opinion that the struggle waged by the Opposition was not energetic enough and he inaugurated a campaign abroad on his own accord and risk."

Even before 1925 the avenue of internal information to the Comintern workers was already controlled by Stalin and his literary flunkeys, as Trotsky's letter to Muralov shows: "Having no access to the official Communist press and desiring at any cost to give the widest possible publicity to Lenin's Testament, Eastman handed it over to an American bourgeois newspaper... Even on the pages of a bourgeois newspaper the 'Testament' of Lenin remains Lenin's testament."

In addition Eastman published a book *Since Lenin Died,* disclosing some unsavory facts about Stalin in connection with the Georgian scandal and telling in a few plain words about the state of affairs in the Russian Communist Party: "With Stalin—who possesses all the craftiness that Trotsky lacks—in the key position as secretary of the party, and with Zinoviev enthusiastically cooperating, Kamenev not unwilling, and Bukharin easy to influence, they proceeded, by all those subtle means which the reader understands, to build up an efficient political machine for grabbing and holding the power within the party." (19). Eastman did something which the Russian Opposition leaders avoided doing. In the few words quoted above he hit the nail on the head.

Eastman's revelations caused a stir in the Comintern. Many a sincere revolutionist was alarmed and felt that if Eastman's story of Lenin's Will were true, if what he wrote of Stalin, Zinoviev and of

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

other leaders of the Russian Party were a fact, then obviously an uncompromising fight against the Stalin clique would have to be launched at once.

2. *Trotsky to the Rescue*

Clearly, the Trio had to take immediate steps to forestall a storm among the workers in the Comintern. In everybody's imagination Trotsky was *the* leader of the Opposition. He, therefore, was the logical person either to confirm Eastman's exposure and press the fight for the annihilation of the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev clique or to deny the whole story. In the private letter to Muralov made public only in the 1930's Trotsky energetically condemned any suppression of the Testament: "Lenin's 'Testament' is no state or party secret. It is no crime to publish it. On the contrary, it is a *crime* to keep it hidden from the Party and from the working class." (*New Int.* Nov. 1934, 125. Our emph.—G.S.). However, when Eastman published the Testament in 1925 Trotsky issued a statement to guide the workers on this momentous question:

"Comrade Lenin has not left any 'will'; the character of his relations to the Party, and the character of the Party itself, exclude the possibility of such a 'will.' The bourgeois and Menshevist press generally understands under the designation 'will' one of Comrade Lenin's letters (which is so much altered as to be almost illegible) in which he gives the Party some organizatory advice. The 13th Party Congress devoted the greatest attention to this and the other letters, and drew the conclusions corresponding to the situation obtaining. All talk wih regard to a concealed or mutilated 'will' is nothing but a despicable lie, directed against the real will of Comrade Lenin and against the interests of the party created by him." (*Inprecor* Sept. 3, 1925, No. 68, 1005)

Replying to the exposure of Stalin with a pack of lies, Trotsky not only shielded the bandits of power by emphatically denying the existence of the Testament but deliberately injected the impression that Lenin's "real will" was to maintain the Stalin leadership! And Trotsky attacked the man who attempted to bring the burocratic machinations to the attention of the workers:

"Eastman sneers with vulgar aplomb at my 'Don Quixotry' in my relations to the comrades of the Central Committee, of whom I have spoken in *friend*ly terms even in the midst of the most embittered discussion. Eastman seems to think himself called upon to correct my 'error,' and he characterizes the leading comrades of our Party in a manner which cannot be designated as anything else but calumny." (*Ib.* Our emph.—G.S.)

The immediate basic problem Stalin as well as Trotsky faced was to restore confidence in the Stalin machine. Trotsky dealt with the dangerous situation in a bold manner. He enveloped Stalin and the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

burocratic order with moral soundness and revolutionary integrity, warning the workers not to believe Eastman:

"We see from the above that Eastman has attempted to erect his construction on completely rotten foundations. He seizes upon isolated incidents occurring within our Party in the course of some discussion, in order, by means of distorting the meaning of the facts and exaggerating the relations in a ridiculous manner, to slander our Party and undermine the *confidence* in it.

"It seems to me however that the attentive and thoughtful reader will not require to examine into the assertions made by Eastman and his documents (which is not possible for all) but that it suffices to ask: 'If we assume that the malicious characterization of our leading Party comrades given by Eastman is only partly correct, how is it possible that this Party should have emerged from long years of illegal struggle, how could it stand at the head of masses of millions carried through the greatest revolution of the world, and further the formation of revolutionary parties in other countries?'

"There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman. It contains within itself its own refutation. Whatever Eastman's intentions may be, this piece of botched work is none the less objectively a tool of counter-revolution, and can solely serve the ends of the incarnate enemies of communism and of the revolution. July 1, 1925, L. Trotsky." (*Ib.* Our emphasis—G.S.)

Five years later, when Eastman's book was forgotten by the Comintern workers, and Trotsky lived in exile in Turkey, the Trotsky press, cautiously silent about his 1925 statement, advertised the book:

"*Since Lenin Died* by Max Eastman

"The book that first told the inside story of the struggle between the Opposition and the burocracy in the Communist Party in Russia. The details of how the conspiracy was hatched against Leon Trotsky by Stalin, Zinoviev, Bucharin and others, was recounted originally in this excellent volume. It is invaluable for an understanding of present day events in Russian and the world Communist movement." (*Militant,* May 3, 1930)

3. *The Effect of Trotsky's Act*

Because the Comintern leadership vociferously backed Trotsky's statement, the honest workers in the Comintern quite naturally accepted the word of the famous organizer of the Red Army against the word of Eastman.

Due to Trotsky, Eastman's attempt to expose Stalin had the very opposite result. Workers viewed Eastman's "slanders" and "malicious fabrications" as a monstrous effort to undermine confidence in the leaders of the major party of the Comintern. The misinformed Communist workers felt that it was necessary to rally still more determinedly to the Russian leadership and redoubled the fight against all those

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

who cast doubt on the revolutionary integrity of Stalin and the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

When Trotsky's slanderous attack on Eastman was published in the Soviet Union (*Bolshevik*, Sept. 1, 1925), the anti-Stalin Communist workers were dazed. For some "strange" reason Trotsky had killed the exposure of Stalin. Little did they suspect that Trotsky's basic interests were indissoluble from those of the Stalinist burocracy.

The Opposition leaders, Radek, Preobrajensky and others, knew that Trotsky lied, for they had been present when Kamenev read Lenin's Testament at the secret session of the top-ranking burocrats. They all maintained a stony silence. Indeed, in his letter to Muralov, Trotsky asserted that the leaders of the Opposition had decided he should sign the statement disavowing the existence of Lenin's will. Together with Trotsky they sank to a new depth of Stalinist depravity.

4. *Trotsky's Flimsy Excuses for the Attack on Eastman*

In 1928, after Stalin himself, no longer fearing the consequences, had publicly admitted the existence of Lenin's Testament, Trotsky had to offer excuses to the Oppositionists for his crime. He did so in his letter to Muralov: "In the Autumn of 1925 the majority in the Political Bureau foisted upon me a statement concocted by themselves containing a sharp condemnation of Max Eastman."

The nature of the statement on Eastman bears witness that the document was Trotsky's even if he himself did not pen it. For in his apologetic letter to Muralov Trotsky gave the game away when he admitted that his statement on Eastman was in accord with his own policy: "In any case, my then statement on Eastman can be understood *only* as an *integral part* of our then *line* toward conciliation and peacemaking." (Our emph.—G.S.)

In the letter to Muralov Trotsky declared further that Stalin presented him with an ultimatum. What was the nature of this alleged ultimatum? "That is why upon the decision of the leading group of *the Opposition,* I signed the statement on Max Eastman *foisted upon me by the majority in the* Political Bureau with the ultimatum: either sign the statement as written, or enter into an open struggle on this account."

Trotsky got himself so entangled in contradictions that he occasionally reached the heights of absurdity. There can be only one logical interpretation of the "ultimatum" with which Trotsky was allegedly confronted. Stalin supposedly laid down the following condition: Either deny Eastman's exposure or come out in an *open struggle* against me and confirm the exposure. The utter impossibility of such an "ultimatum" is too obvious. Impelled to present excuses Trotsky became involved in the most preposterous and illogical fabrications.

One might entertain the illusion that Stalin could threaten Trotsky with G.P.U. tortures. Nothing is farther from actuality. In giving excuses for his deed Trotsky was unable to go to the lengths of saying

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

there was a threat from the G.P.U. Even three years later, in 1928, after the entire Opposition, Trotsky included, had been expelled, Stalin did not dare injure Trotsky physically for fear of the workers. The clearest substantiation of this is furnished by Trotsky himself:

"To the uninitiated it might seem incomprehensible why Stalin's clique first exiled me abroad and then tries to kill me. Wouldn't it have been simpler to have shot me in Moscow like so many others? Here is the explanation. In 1928 when I was expelled from the party and exiled to Central Asia it was still impossible to talk not only of execution but even of arrest. The generation with which I had gone through the October revolution and the Civil War was still alive. The Political Bureau felt itself besieged from all sides. From Central Asia I had the opportunity of maintaining unbroken connections with the opposition which was growing. In these conditions Stalin, after vacillating for a year, decided to apply exile abroad as the lesser evil." (*Fourth Int.* Nov. 1940, 149)

If the Stalin clique did not dare to touch Trotsky in 1928-29, a year after he had been expelled from the Party, it is clear that in 1925, when Trotsky was still a member of the Central Committee, a member of the Political Bureau, and a member of the Executive Committee of the Comintern, Stalin, for his own safety, would never allow any physical action against Trotsky. Trotsky shielded the Stalin clique because he was tied to it for life, not because of fear of the G.P.U.

5. *A Valuable Footnote in Eastman's Book*

The whole fanciful tale about Stalin's "ultimatum" can definitely be dismissed as a purest fabrication in the light of a footnote in Eastman's *Since Lenin Died,* which says that in the Spring of 1924 Eastman revealed to Trotsky that he knew of the existence of Lenin's Testament. This had occurred over a year *before* Trotsky attacked Eastman. During their talk about the Testament Stalin was not standing behind Trotsky's back threatening him with an "ultimatum." Yet Trotsky acted as a vigilant Stalinist. Here is what Eastman states: "Subsequently I met him for a moment accidentally: I told him that I knew about 'The Testament of Lenin' and he told me to regard whatever I knew as an 'absolute secret.'" (26). Eastman placed the words "*absolute secret*" in quotation marks, indicating that these words were not his but Trotsky's.

In the letter to Muralov Trotsky considered it a crime to keep Lenin's Testament hidden from the workers. In the 1924 talk with Eastman Trotsky was not only committing that crime but was attempting to make Eastman a party to it. But Trotsky knew how to lecture others: "People who know about crimes and keep quiet are considered criminals themselves." (*Third Int. After Lenin,* 304)

It will be fruitful to spend another moment on Trotsky's 1925 statement in which he declared that: "There is no sincere worker who will believe in the picture painted by Eastman. It contains within

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

itself its own refutation." As a matter of fact Trotsky repudiated Eastman's book *in advance* without even having read it or seen it. He admitted this in a letter to the Stalinist editor of the London *Sunday Worker*. "The book by Eastman which you mention is unknown to me. The bourgeois newspapers quoting the book have not reached me. It need not be said that I categorically repudiate *in advance* any commentary directed against the Communist Party in Russia." (Quoted by Trotsky in Statement on Eastman. Our emph.—G.S.)

6. *"Revolutionary" Lying Elevated to a Fine Art.*

At the hearings before the Dewey Commission in Coyocan, Mexico in 1937 Trotsky resorted to elaborate verbal trickery to excuse his crime of denying the existence of the Testament: "I admit that my denial had a diplomatic nature, imposed upon me by the inner situation of the Party. If you ask me, Mr. Commissioner, if it was *the most clear truth* I have declared in my life, I would answer "No.' It was not the genuine truth. It was an equivocal document. That I must recognize. It was imposed on me. I am a political man. It was imposed upon me by the situation. It was not a lie, but was not the full truth." (*The Case,* 430. Our emph.—G.S.). Trotsky no longer gave the excuse of "ultimatum"; now it was "the situation" which had compelled him to attack Eastman.

The work of the Dewey Commission was to determine whether Trotsky was guilty of the "charges" made against him by Stalin at the Moscow Trials. In such a setting Trotsky, of course, was perfectly safe, for the "charges" were nothing but the continuation of the intrigue against him originated by Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev. At the hearings in Coyocan there was no one to conduct the investigation along the correct path.

7. *Olgin's Sardonic Note*

The Stalin burocrats made good use of Trotsky's pro-Stalin lies, turning them into weapons against Trotsky himself. Moissaye J. Olgin, a leader in the American section of the Comintern, furnished an instance of the clever manner in which this was achieved. Shielding his Master in the Kremlin Olgin cited Trotsky's words from Trotsky's Statement reprinted in the *Daily Worker* of August 8, 1925, "All talk about a secreted or infringed 'will' is so much mischievous invention," and went on: "When it was in Trotsky's interest to divorce himself from such a 'disciple' as Max Eastman (whose book, *Since Lenin Died,* was a stench in the nostrils of every revolutionist) Trotsky wrote a scathing article refuting the legend about Lenin's will and concluding with the words: 'His (Eastman's) booklet can only render service to the worst enemies of Communism and revolution. It therefore objectively constitutes a weapon of counter-revolution.' (*Ib.*). When it was in Trotsky's interest to make a show of far-flung in-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

fluence, Eastman is made one of the pillars of the new 'party of revolutionary Marxism' and the 'mischievious invention' is peddled as Lenin's will. Now Trotsky again publishes a pamphlet to show that the 'testament' was true. These counter-revolutionists have so much entangled themselves in a network of lies and falsehoods that they cannot make a single move without perfidy." (*Trotskyism*, 139)

The truth is that *all* the Stalinist burocrats—in grace or in disgrace—are inextricably tangled in contradictions, inconsistencies and evasion of the *whole* truth about the rise of Stalin to power.

CHAPTER XII.

STALIN BREAKS WITH ZINOVIEV AND KAMENEV

1. *The Birth of the "New Opposition"*

NOTHING would indicate to an investigator that prior to the opening of the Fourteenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party there was a cleavage in the ruling Trio. One can perceive a sign of friction between the solid Stalin section of Moscow and the Zinovievist Leningrad. But officially there seemed to be perfect harmony among Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev. Five days before the opening of the Congress Kamenev was reported to have said: "All the theses on all reports for the Party Congress have been adopted unanimously." (*Pravda*, Dec. 13, 1925). Even when the Congress convened there were no manifestations of its becoming within a brief space of time a theatre of acrimonious controversy between the faction of Stalin and the newly-risen faction of Zinoviev and Kamenev. The workers might have expected, if anything, a renewal of the onslaught upon Trotsky. The agenda for the Fourteenth Congress proposed by Stalin's political stewards was adopted without a voice of dissent. When Stalin appeared as the reporter for the Central Committee all rose and cheered including the Zinoviev-controlled Leningrad delegation. In his report Stalin made no mention of Zinoviev and Kamenev and said nothing to lead the workers to expect the storm that was soon to shake the burocratic assembly.

Of a sudden, on the second day, a startling event rent the political air of the Soviet Union. A group of delegates from Leningrad presented to the Presidium a request that Zinoviev be permitted to make a co-report. The "New Opposition" officially burst into full view.

With the leading figures of the New Opposition, Zinoviev and Kamenev, we are already familiar. Zinoviev had been one of the sharpest tools cutting away at the Trotsky Opposition workers. As to Kamenev, only several short months prior to the Fourteenth Congress he had taken an active hand against Eastman's exposure. Another leader of the New Opposition or Leningrad Opposition was Lenin's

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

widow. To establish the transformation in her political attitude after Lenin died, it is sufficient to cite an article she had written on Eastman. She termed his exposure of the Trio's intrigue against Trotsky "a bundle of lies". She also covered up the true character of the Leninist Levy and cynically shielded Stalin and his gang:

"The most monstrous thing in Eastman's book is that he did not understand the significance of the 'Leninist recruiting' and continues to talk of the separation of the Party from the masses. To Mr. Eastman the Party congress is a congress of Party burocrats. The enemies of the R.K.P. (Bolsheviks) are endeavouring to utilize the 'testament' to discredit the leaders of the Party, so as to discredit the Party itself. M. Eastman also busied himself with slandering the Central Committee outright, as if the 'testament' were concealed, endeavouring to arouse unhealthy curiosity, distorting the real meaning of the letter." (*Bolshevik*, No. 16, 1925)

Another of the burocrats leading the New Opposition was Lashevich. His politics are instantly grasped when it is learned that he was one of the inventors of "Trotskyism" (*Stalin School*, 92).

These people lost sight of the fact that history often plays amazing tricks with opportunists. Zinoviev and Kamenev saw their ambitions and dreams fading out and their prospects darkening. They began to feel the pinch of the monster they themselves had so assiduously labored to create. A real confession to the workers being out of the question, they were compelled to continue on their road of lies and hypocrisy. This road led them many years hence to the Stalinist "confessions" at the Moscow Trials.

2. *When Thieves Fall Out*

Zinoviev wrapped his "oppositional" co-report at the Fourteenth Congress in a "theoretical" garb.

His speech appeared to be petty and baseless nagging at the Central Committee. His issue was the question of the Party's attitude toward the peasantry.

He called for a firmer policy on this question: "Of course, we have the best Central Committee we know of; nobody can argue against the fact that it is the elite of the entire Party, of course, but this does not mean that we have to indulge in self-praise, and it does not mean that we will accept firm gestures for firm politics. On the question of the peasantry, an important, decisive question, much more firmness must be shown than has been up to this time." (*Pravda*, Dec. 23, 1925)

In the fierce debates which followed Zinoviev's co-report, the verbal camouflage lifted somewhat to afford a glimpse of the real issue involving both anti-Trotsky factions. Some of the revealing remarks blurted out by the impassioned antagonists were kept out of the press. Not all of them, we suspect, were entered into the *Stenographic Report*. But what was allowed to be recorded is sufficient as a guide.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Zinoviev's co-report was only indirectly aimed at Stalin. It was levelled at Stalin's accredited theoretician and factional cat's-paw, Bukharin. And because the Kamenev-Zinoviev group had to keep the entire conspiracy for power a secret, the Stalin faction was able to demolish the New Opposition. One of Stalin's new favorites, Rykov, later a victim of the Moscow Trials, disclosed that on the eve of the Fourteenth Congress the leaders of the Stalin coterie and Zinoviev had had a talk, Zinoviev being ready and willing to render full support to Stalin in every field if only Stalin did not press for organizational changes in the Leningrad leadership. But the Stalin faction insisted upon alterations in the Leningrad organization, accusing Zinoviev of building up a rival center in Leningrad. This, Rykov declared, was the main point of disagreement with Zinoviev:

"When on the eve of the Congress we discussed with Comrade Zinoviev the question of what to do to avoid the fever in the Party and in the country, Comrade Zinoviev told us that in his opinion we could sit down at a common table and unanimously draw up a resolution on the report of the Central Committee, that they accepted and did not dispute all the theses of Comrade Stalin. But, he said, one thing we cannot do and that is to allow changes in the leadership of the Leningrad organization and anything to happen to its present leaders. Above all they are interested that Leningrad remain an independent competing centre, with its press organ, etc. Consequently, the main point of disagreement is the question of whether there should be one centre in the Party or two. We assume that there can be only one centre in the Party (a voice from the seats: 'Correct!'). Unity must be preserved. No matter what sort of a majority it is, it can lead the Party only if there are no competitive centres. (voice from the seats: 'Correct!'). We did not agree with Comrade Zinoviev's posing the question about the Leningrad organization, and therefore he did not agree to a project of the resolution and came out with the co-report on the tribune of the Congress." (*S.R.* 413)

Stalin's other henchman, Tomsky, whom the General Secretary kept at the pinnacle of the burocratic edifice of the trade unions, eventually a suicide during mass arrests by Stalin, showed that the New Opposition had lacked courage to inform the Leningrad workers that it had differences with the Stalin majority of the Central Committee. The disagreements, reported Tomsky, did not involve the Kulak, or the NEP, but were over the jobs of Zinoviev supporters, Safarov and Sarkis:

"Didn't we attempt to find peaceful ways of solving these questions before the Congress. Let us make concessions, let us find where the disagreements are. But what was it upon which we broke, Comrade Kamenev? What was it upon which we did not get together? You think we did not get together upon the question of the attitude towards the Kulak, upon the question of state capitalism? Do you think that four members of the Politburo on the one side, and Kamenev

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and Zinoviev on the other, did not get together on the question of the NEP? No, we did not agree with respect to Safarov and Sarkis. That is what we did not agree on! (Voices: 'Disgrace!')" (283)

To an initiated eye the performance at the Fourteenth Congress of the RCP was hardly a mystery. Stalin had great power and he was driving for more. Zinoviev realized that he was threatened with the loss of Leningrad, the base of his burocratic might, and was attempting to counteract Stalin's merciless drive. The heated atmosphere at the Congress was filled with mutual recriminations, with charges of wanton burocratism, of lying, of hypocrisy. Zinoviev's aide, Lashevich, asserted that there was no genuine collective leadership in the Central Committee and in the Politburo:

"It seems to me, so far as I have been observing the work both in the Central Committee and in the Politburo, to the extent of my being informed of the inside work, I know that no real collective leadership actually existed. (Voice from the seats: 'Has there been no Triumvirate?') I shall presently talk of the Triumvirate, if you wish, and of septemvirate and of a few other things if you desire." (181)

Lashevich spotlighted the burocratic intimidations of Stalin's hatchetman of the Moscow Party organization, Uglanov. At the same time Lashevich attempted to show that the support to Zinoviev voiced by some collectives of the Leningrad district was a proof of freedom of discussion in the area controlled by the New Opposition:

"Of course, in the domain of Comrade Uglanov there is no commotion. This is true. (Laughter). But go to such districts as Vyborg, which is the best district. There a few collectives have expressed themselves against the leading line. Comrades there have their own independent point of view. What does a comparison between these two districts show? (Voice from the seat, 'Poor Party work was done.'). It shows that in the latter district there exists the possibility of speaking and discussing freely. (Laughter, noise, protests, applause from the Leningrad delegation). But just dare to utter a peep in the Moscow organization. (Laughter). It is said that at the conference in Comrade Uglanov's kingdom a Comrade Chernishev, who is unknown to me, attempted to open his mouth. He was removed in 24 hours... I can also ask: how many workers, generally speaking, has comrade Uglanov removed to create the kingdom of compliance and calm in Moscow? Their number is counted by the tens and perhaps even by the hundreds. (Voices from the seats: 'It was necessary. Not more than you have'). Comrades, if a printed confirmation is needed to prove how comrade Uglanov understands democracy, then here is what I can read to you. In his concluding words at the Moscow Conference he said (I shall cite only the end.): 'Our further task must consist in the continuation of centralization of our organization from top to bottom, centralization of leadership. Collective leadership must be subordinated to this centralization. This is the fundamental basis and

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a genuine expression in deeds of inner-party democracy.' (Stormy applause.)"

And Lashevich announced that *such* a form of "collective leadership" the New Opposition rejected: "Thus, comrades, if this is called building 'collective guidance' of the Party, then we cannot accept it." But he could not fool Stalin's partisans regarding his policy on Party "democracy." They understood that he too was not a promoter of collective leadership, as his role in the crusade against "Trotskyism" had demonstrated. They knew that he also was an ardent apostle of burocratic centralism, only the centre he worked in was not Moscow but Leningrad.

Virtually dropping in one instance all the "theoretical" pretenses, both the New Opposition and the Stalin majority touched directly upon the kernel of the matter, Stalin's personal power. Tomsky replied to the complaints of the New Opposition: "What has been said here, and what some comrades have attempted to picture, is ridiculous —as if someone has concentrated power in his hands and the remaining majority of the Central Committee is supporting him. How could this happen? No, Comrade Kamenev, if you pose the question that the system of personal leaders must not exist, then we say, we struggled against it all the time; the system of personal leaders must not exist, and it shall not be, yes, it shall not be. (Applause)." (289)

It was Stalin himself who laid down the "collective leadership" smokescreen at the Fourteenth Congress: "Certainly the Party will not prostrate itself before any individual leader," and he stressed his supposed intention of having "collective work, collective leadership . . ." Tomsky merely carried out Stalin's line. Like Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev before him, this loyal Stalin henchman did not grasp that burocratic centralism feeds on its diverse supporters.

Kamenev, who had himself previously sanctioned the suppression of every attempt at opposition to Stalin, now related in plaintive tones that he and his friends had been forbidden to come out with their "position" earlier: "You may ask: why do you come out at the Congress, why didn't you come out before, (voice: 'with a co-report') and why do you come out with a co-report? We come out at the Congress, comrades, because we were hindered and were forbidden to come out until now." (247)

Zinoviev complained that the Leningrad organization had been living in a state of semi-siege: "Every Leningrad Party worker will testify that for a whole year the Leningrad organization has been living in an atmosphere of gossip and in a condition of a semi-siege. (Voices: 'It's a lie!' 'Correct!')." (451)

Without denying the accusations of burocratic high-handedness and ideological terror, Molotov reduced Zinoviev's supporters to silence by demanding to know how much democracy had been practiced by the Leningrad burocratic ring: "Did the Leningrad organization, at least in the way of minimum democracy, discuss these proposals

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which are offered today in its name to the Party Congress? Were they discussed or not? For some reason we hear no reply. Evidently not. (Applause.Voice: 'They are silent')."

Molotov continued: "Did the Leningrad Party organization, the workers of 'Red Putilov,' the workers of 'Bolshevik,' of the Baltic plant, of the 'Red Triangle,' and others know anything about the new proposals of Comrade Zinoviev which are being laid before the Congress? I believe that they did not know, that they never heard of them, never thought or guessed about them. This, indeed, is democracy of a special kind." (483)

While the Stalin faction appeared quite consistent, the Zinoviev-Kamenev faction seemed to be the essence of contradiction. At the Congress the Stalin faction sustained the position on the basis of which the Party membership had "elected" all the "delegates." On the other side, the Zinovievites, after they had been "elected" at the Leningrad Conference upon the line of support to official policy of the Central Committee, made a sharp about-face at the Congress. Stalin made good use of this glaring incongruity and showed that his former partners were doublecrossing the Leningrad Party rank-and-file. Dominating the Congress, his faction adopted an appeal to all Party members of Leningrad:

"Your *conference* voted *confidence* in the Central Committee and entrusted you to vote this confidence at the Congress. Your *delegation* at the Congress voted *against confidence* in the Central Committee... While in the district conferences and even at the provincial Party conference the leaders of the Opposition did not speak of any differences with the Central Committee and under the banner of loyalty to the Party leadership were collecting votes, at the Congress they came out as a separate group, counterposing itself to the Central Committee of our Party." ("Resolution of the Fourteenth Congress of the RCP. Appeal to the members of the Leningrad organisation.")

3. *More Details of the Rift*

In their speeches at the Fourteenth Congress both factions revealed many details of the development of the rift in the Trio. As Stalin had shouldered his way into the limelight, the urge to get rid of the partners who shared his power became intensified. He came out with the first public attack against them immediately after the Thirteenth Congress of the Bolshevik Party. He delivered a report on the Results of the Thirteenth Congress (*Pravda*, June 20, 1924) in which he criticised Zinoviev's formulation of the dictatorship of the Party written over a year before. He also made a dig at Kamenev. Zinoviev and Kamenev understood only too well the fraudulent nature of the issue Stalin had picked, for the formulation which he attacked had been unanimously adopted by the Twelfth Congress and approved by Stalin himself. With this thrust against Zinoviev and Kamenev, Stalin's campaign to dissolve the partnership had gotten under way.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Realizing the dangerous implications of Stalin's new attitude, Zinoviev had met with several of his aids and supporters to review the situation. (Zinoviev, *Sten. Report of the Fourteenth Congress of the R.C.P.* 454). The seasoned intriguer, Zinoviev, feigning lack of understanding, had asked the General Secretary what prompted him to come out against his partners in the Trio. Stalin then evasively replied that he wanted to broaden the leadership. Zinoviev asserted that he was heartily in favor of broadening the leadership but that such things should be done in private: "And when Stalin was asked why he came out with his article, he answered that he aimed to broaden the leading nucleus because it had become narrow. We answered to that: Naturally, no one is saying that the Trio should lead, there is need of a much broader, collective leadership. None of us ever maintained that only the Trio should lead, but all decidedly protested against such things being done through the press." (455)

Zinoviev and Kamenev had yielded ground. Stalin then drew Bukharin, Voroshilov, Kalinin and Kuibishev into the leading nucleus, thus completely dominating this secret center of power against Zinoviev and Kamenev. References to the Septemvirate were made by several speakers on the floor of the Congress.

Stalin gave his version of the history of the breach. The first difference, according to him, had been on the question of what to do with Trotsky: "How did our differences begin? They began with the question: 'What are we to do with Comrade Trotsky?' That was at the close of 1924. To begin with, the Leningrad group wanted to expel Comrade Trotsky from the Party. I am talking of the discussion which took place in 1924. The Leningrad Provincial Committee passed a resolution demanding the expulsion of Comrade Trotsky. We, that is, the majority of the Central Committee, were not in favor of such a step. (Voices: 'Quite right!')." (502)

Had Stalin's Central Committee expelled Trotsky from the Party while he still occupied a position of power as Commissar of War, was a member of the Central Committee, of the Politburo, of the Comintern Executive, such a premature action would have brought irreparable injury to the General Secretary's ambitious game. And it would have been easier for Zinoviev and Kamenev to fish in troubled anti-Stalin waters. But Stalin proved too sly to fall into their trap.

4. *Zinoviev and Kamenev in a Desperate Strait*

Realizing the consequences of the change in Stalin's attitude towards them the leaders of the New Opposition indicated they would resist Stalin's crushing tactics. Zinoviev stated in his concluding remarks to the Congress: "And do you think that we will maintain silence like corpses, will remain with all the labels you are attempting to stick on us and will not try to explain to the Party that we are not liquidators, not Axelrodists, not defeatists. (Voices: 'Trotsky main-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tained silence.' Ordjonikidze: 'You will not be permitted.')" (463. *Pravda,* Dec. 30, 1925)

Kamenev boldly ventured to announce his conviction that Stalin was not the man to unify the "staff"—a defiance which Trotsky, whom the historians built up as *the* oppositionist to Stalin, never even attempted to show. Kamenev declared: "We are against creating the theory of 'the leader', we are against fashioning 'the leader . . . ' I have arrived at the conviction that Comrade Stalin is not capable of fulfilling the role of a unifier of the Bolshevik staff. (Voices from the seats: 'Not true.' 'Nonsense!' 'Oh, so that's what it is.' 'You have shown your hand.' Noise. Applause of the Leningrad delegation. Shouts: 'We will not give you commanding heights!' 'We want Stalin!' 'We want Stalin!' Stormy applause.)"

Almost all the burocrats—Bukharin, Rykov, Tomsky, Uglanov and others who yelled at the Fourteenth Congress "We want Stalin" were later murdered by Stalin. Meanwhile they stood as his political bodyguard with the spearheads pointed at Zinoviev and Kamenev.

But while the personal rift became sharply pronounced at the last session of the Congress, *politically,* the New Opposition, like Trotsky, was securely tied to Stalin. Zinoviev in his concluding remarks found it necessary to declare explicitly: "We do not counterpose any kind of a line of our own to that of the Central Committee." This declaration completely revealed the utter hollowness and baseness of the Zinoviev-Kamenev opposition.

Having failed to show political, moral or any other valid grounds for criticising Stalin, the New Opposition made itself a laughing stock and strengthened Stalin's hand. Stalin's press was full of jubilant messages from the Party membership extolling the Central Committee and abusively censuring the New Opposition. The Party was renamed "The All-Union Communist Party" and all the other Stalinist Parties in the Soviet Union were brought under one head. Burocratic centralism had ascended another step.

The Congress over, the dread of repressive measures most likely commenced to tug disquietingly at the harassed mind of Zinoviev and Kamenev. And they were not long in waiting. No sooner had the "discussion" terminated than the merciless General Secretary, flinging off the rhetoric, rolled up his sleeves and applied his organizational axe to the New Opposition.

5. *Where Was the Leader of the Left Opposition?*

But what of Trotsky, where was he during the stupendous occurrence that shook the whole Stalinist burocracy? Trotsky was a member of the Presidium of the Fourteenth Congress, having been "elected" to that "august" body *unanimously.* What was the reaction of this "oppositionist" when the New Opposition appeared on the scene? Watching Stalin's and Zinoviev's marionettes hurling abuse at each other, he took no active part in the debates. His supporters, the leaders

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the old Moscow Opposition, also refrained from participating in the bitter dispute. While Stalin was extending his power, Trotsky and his associates elected to remain "neutral."

It would not be quite accurate to say that Trotsky was completely silent at the Congress, for, in truth, he did speak. But his speech was brief, the shortest he ever delivered in his entire life at any political gathering. It consisted of only *one word.* He uttered it when Zinoviev gave the reason for having proposed to expel him from the Politburo. Zinoviev was saying: "We held to the following point of view: if we, the Party as a whole, arrived at the point of accusing Trotsky of semi-Menshevism and said it quite definitely in the resolution; if for several months we have been telling the entire country, the whole world, what we considered him to be—since we have said this to the Party,—then for such a comrade, at least at the present period, there can be no room in the general staff of Leninism, in the basic organ of the Bolshevik Party. We figured that the one who says 'a,' must say 'b.' (Trotsky from his seat: 'Correct!')." (459)

That single word was Trotsky's only statement to the Fourteenth Congress—his only manifestation of "opposition" to Stalin; it was his first step in the direction of an "agreement" with Zinoviev and Kamenev.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE STALIN-TROTSKY BETRAYAL OF THE BRITISH WORKERS

1. *The Formation of the Anglo-Russian Committee*

WHILE burocratic convulsions agitated the workers in Russia they continued to cast their eye hopefully at the international scene, particularly England, where a revolutionary crisis was developing.

The security of the British capitalists hinged upon the workers' trust in the trade union burocracy, particularly in the Left wing burocracy which employed a "class-struggle" mask to hide the fact that it was an agent of British imperialism. The Stalin gang, always apprehensive of potential revolutionary crisis in the bourgeois world, launched a policy of tying the British revolutionary-minded workers to the Left trade union burocrats and to the imperialistic British Labor Party. Early in January 1924 the Stalinist press reported that the British Communist Party had addressed an open letter to the secretary of the British Labor Party, promising support to his organization:

"The Communist Party sent the secretary of the Labor Party, Henderson, an open letter in which it expresses its satisfaction with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the successes of the Labor Party in the election and simultaneously points out that this success places an extremely serious responsibility on the Party in view of the possibility of increased pressure by the privileged classes. The Communist Party further expresses it readiness, as a political organization of the proletariat, to support the Labor Party with all measures, convinced that the Labor Party will be able with a direct open policy to shield itself from all sorts of intrigues and thus aid in the unification of the entire English working class on the basis of support to the Labor Government." (*Pravda,* Jan. 6, 1924)

Thus did the Stalinists invest the labor agency of British imperialism with an attractive mantle.

In the Summer of 1924 the Russian trade union burocrats invited Purcell, president of the British Trade Union Congress, to visit the Soviet Union, and in November 1924 a delegation of British trade union officials arrived in Moscow with their wives and friends. The guests were lodged in the best quarters. They were regaled with a Byzantine orgy of food and drink. The Stalinists had developed the art of sumptuous entertainment to a degree that would have shamed even the Tzarist diplomatic corps. Many years later at the hearings of the Dewey Commission, Trotsky showed that he was well aware of what was going on: "I myself, for example, was afraid at the end of 1924 when they began to pay the leaders of the workers' movement in Great Britain. I will not give here names. I will communicate the names. They gave to the wives of the leaders—they dared not give money—they gave jewelry to the wives who visited Russia, to win their sympathy." (*The Case,* 320)

After the feasts both sides exchanged warm speeches. Upon their return to England the British trade union burocrats issued a report in which they commended the Stalinist government and expressed sympathy for its "achievements." This strengthened the illusion among the Comintern workers that these leaders were accepting revolutionary ideas, and bore eloquent witness to the "correctness" of the policy of the Comintern. In the Spring of 1925 a Russian trade union delegation headed by Tomsky returned the visit. Friendship ripened between the Stalinist and the British trade union burocrats. On this visit Tomsky and the British leaders agreed to form an Anglo-Russian Trade Union Unity Committee, later known as Anglo-Russian Committee. The professed purpose of this body was the promotion of world trade union unity and of struggle against war and reaction.

2. *Trotsky's Policy on the Anglo-Russian Committee*

Following his expulsion from the Party Trotsky vigorously attacked the Stalin-concocted Anglo-Russian Committee as an aid to the British General Council of Trade Unions. "From beginning to end, the entire policy of the Anglo-Russian Committee, because of its false line, provided only aid to the General Council." (*Third Int. After Lenin,* 131)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky and his supporters have concealed his own true line during the formation of the Anglo-Russian Committee and, *most important,* during and immediately following the General Strike in May 1926.

During the formation of the Committee Trotsky was taking his "rest from politics." In the Spring of 1925 he finished a book *Whither England.* It contained not a single word regarding the policy of the Comintern in England. The first mention Trotsky made of the Anglo-Russian Committee, as far as we have been able to ascertain, was in January 1926. Speaking before a Congress of textile workers many months after Tomsky had carried out Stalin's assignment, Trotsky in a scientific vein "evaluated" the origin of the Anglo-Russian Committee: "Today, I believe, you sent greetings to the Anglo-Russian Committee of Unity of the trade union movement. What is the source of the origin of that Committee? It stems from the economic decline of England." (*Pravda,* Jan. 31, 1926)

By offering this supposed clarification Trotsky cooperated with Stalin in obscuring the fact that the source of the origin of the Committee was the burocratic regime in Russia not the "economic decline of England." Trotsky also drew a protective veil over the opportunism of the Purcells:

"If 25 years ago—and this is a short time—the Russian revolutionists of those days had proposed fraternization to the labor leaders, if the same Tomsky had been sent to London 20 years ago to establish unity with the English trade unions, they would have sent him to the devil, naturally in a British not in a Russian fashion. (Laughter). But at present the trade unions receive Tomsky in a brotherly manner. Why? The reason is that the last decades have undermined British industry, there is not a trace left of the privileged position of the working class, and the English worker is becoming politically proletarianized. He seeks a new support, and it is no accident that he finds it first of all in our Soviet trade unions. The Anglo-Russian Committee of unity of trade unions is the highest expression of that shift in the situation of all Europe, and especially of England, which is occurring before our eyes and which is leading toward the European revolution." (*Ib.*)

In another speech Trotsky again reinforced the fraud about the Russian leaders being true proletarian revolutionists: "It is true that the English workers sing the 'Internationale' often incorrectly, from MacDonald's notes, but it is precisely in Moscow that they will learn to sing the 'Internationale' without error. (Applause)." (*Pravda,* March 5, 1926)

3. *The British General Strike*

In May the tension in England culminated in the General Strike. The entire British proletariat suddenly found itself swept by an economic and political tornado of immense proportions. Every day now

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was a breathless epic, with the British workers gaining in militancy and courage. The nervous bourgeoisie relied upon their trade union burocrats who in turn were enabled by the Anglo-Russian Committee to lean upon the British Communist Party behind which stood the power and authority of the Soviet Government. After lasting nine days the Strike was suddenly called off by the trade union leaders and as a result a tremendous collapse occurred in the ranks of the bewildered workers.

During the strike Trotsky was undergoing medical treatment in Berlin. He wrote an article on the situation. A banner headline on the cover of the June 10, 1926 issue of the *International Press Correspondence* (*Inprecor*) announced: "Trotsky on the General Strike." A note by the Stalinist editors stated: "The following was written by Comrade Trotsky on May 6, i.e. six days before the calling off of the general strike by the General Council. Ed." Trotsky's article, omitting any evaluation or even mention of the Comintern policy in England, contained some soothing political opium: "Within the Labour Party, the revolutionary wing will increase in influence and will find more complete expression. The Communists will push forward resolutely. The revolutionary developments of England will advance enormously."

When the revolutionary situation in England was shattered, the Comintern workers, not understanding the nature of the Tomsky-Purcell deal, sought an explanation of another major proletarian debacle. The Stalinist burocrats immediately advanced "explanations" to conceal their own policy of backing the Left trade union burocratic supporters of the Right wing. They placed the chief blame upon the Right-wing leaders of the British Labor Party, with an occasional mild rebuke to the Left leaders.

Convalescing in a Berlin clinic Trotsky was receiving the current issues of *Pravda* and saw how its writers labored to save the face of Stalinist burocrats in the new catastrophe they had brought on for the proletariat. Three years later Trotsky, in Turkish exile, said that the distortion of facts made him indignant! "With great eagerness I gathered and collated in the clinic all the information about the course of the general strike and especially about the relation between the masses and their leaders. What made me indignant most was the nature of the articles in the Moscow *Pravda*. Its chief task consisted in covering up the bankruptcy and saving face. This could be achieved only by a cynical distortion of the facts. There can be no lower intellectual downfall of a revolutionary politician than deception of the masses." (*My Life*, II, 273). We shall presently see the nature of Trotsky's own articles *Pravda* published immediately upon his return to the Soviet Union.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *A Potent Dose of Stalinist Drug*

The General Strike caused a tremendous upsurge among the Russian masses. When it became clear that the British workers had suffered a defeat, the disappointment was very great. Particularly embittered were the anti-Stalin Communist workers. They knew that the "explanation" given by the editors and speakers of Stalin's faction could hardly be trusted. Strongly suspecting that the basic cause for the working class tragedy in England lay in Stalin's policies in the Comintern, the Opposition workers eagerly perused the pages of *Pravda* seeking a word from Trotsky whom they trusted implicitly.

Soon after his return from Berlin Trotsky delivered a speech before the Third All-Union Conference of Workers and Peasants Correspondents (Rabselkor). The Correspondents were really local agitators who covered the wide reaches of the Soviet Union, sent in reports to newspapers and helped to direct thought into channels officially approved by the governing clique. Although many of them were petty careerists seeking promotion to some minor post, there were among them, indubitably, many honest workers whose heads were filled with illusions about the Stalin leadership. Trotsky was the main speaker at the Conference and his speech was printed in *Pravda*. As we have shown, Trotsky in his autobiography remarked that the articles in *Pravda* had made his gorge rise because they distorted the facts about the situation in England to save the face of the Russian leadership. But Trotsky's own words in *Pravda* were of the same face-saving nature.

In his speech to the Rabselkor, Trotsky went to the length of lying that the Comintern, which he knew was guided by the Stalin clique, introduced into England the 1917 Bolshevik policy that had led to the October Revolution:

"When our workers were collecting money and our trade unions sent it to the strikers the English bourgeois press wrote that the Russians are supporting the strike out of patriotic considerations in order to tear down British economy. Curiously, a few weeks prior to the strike, the British near-Socialist Bertrand Russel wrote: 'All the Bolshevik judgements and advices regarding the revolutionary development of England are dictated by patriotism. The Russians want to draw England into a revolutionary uprising, to cause its decline in order thus to stabilize their own situation.'

"These gentlemen forget that in 1917 there arrived in Petrograd one of the English almost-Socialists, Arthur Henderson, one of the false leaders and factual betrayers of the recent general strike, who spoke, for example, as follows: the Bolsheviks are betrayers of Russia, they serve German imperialism, in their soul there is not a trace of healthy national feeling and patriotism. The Mensheviks and S.R.'s —these are the patriots that support the struggle for the independence of the Russian State and democracy.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Such was the voice of official British socialism in 1917 in the sharpest moment when the Bolshevik Party was struggling against the imperialist war. And now, when the Comintern transfers the same principles and methods of Bolshevism to English soil, then this very Henderson together with the *Daily Mail* on the one side, and Russell on the other, no longer says that the Bolsheviks are traitors and betrayers of their fatherland. No. He says the Bolsheviks are the most cunning patriots, they serve the Great-Russian nationalist idea, they want to continue the Tzarist policy and undermine the power of old Britain. These gentlemen lie, turn and twist themselves inside out. But we remain the same. Whether Messrs Hendersons call us traitors to Russia or the most blood-thirsty Russian patriots does not affect us. We were, are and will remain the same. If we are patriots, we are patriots of the working class, including the British, we are patriots of the international proletarian revolution. (Stormy Applause)." (*Pravda*, June 2, 1926)

In this speech Trotsky aligned himself solidly with Stalin to cover up the Comintern's line in England, thus leaving an indelible record of his own participation in that betrayal, exactly as he had done in October 1923 when he publicly supported the "Workers Government" trap in Germany.

When Trotsky wrote *My Life* he was obviously convinced that his uninformed readers would not check his story in the book with his actual line recorded on the pages of *Pravda*.

Although before the workers Trotsky acted in concert with Stalin's speakers and editors, cynically distorting facts to aid the Stalin clique to surmount the crisis produced by the betrayal in England, behind the scenes he now began to assume a somewhat different attitude toward Stalin. For in 1926 Trotsky abandoned his "political holiday." He renewed his attempts to cut with a pasteboard sword the steel coils of burocratic centralism which were slowly strangling him. This phase of Trotsky's activity is bound up with his alliance with Stalin's cast-off partners in the former Trio.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TROTSKY-ZINOVIEV-KAMENEV BLOC

1. *The Propelling Motive of Zinoviev and Kamenev*

RECOGNIZING that their vexatious predicament was the bitter fruit of their common opportunism, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev sought a common ground for defense against the man whom they themselves had solidly entrenched in power. The first indication of a rapprochement, discernible at once to the Stalin faction, appeared at the Fourteenth Congress in Trotsky's one word "speech" of support

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to Zinoviev's argumentation and, more clearly, in a significant hint thrown out by Zinoviev. "When Comrade Zinoviev at the Congress introduced his proposal to draw into the work all the former groups in the Party, the delegates were greatly amazed. From every side came the cries: 'Repeat that!' Comrade Zinoviev repeated his proposal. Then one of the delegates put to him the question: 'With whom are you flirting?' " (Grishin, *Concerning the Opposition Bloc,* R. 22)

Zinoviev and Kamenev imagined that to recoup their lost prestige and power, all that was necessary was to rally the various ousted burocrats hounded by Stalin. In the eyes of Zinoviev and Kamenev the trump card not yet decisively beaten by Stalin was Trotsky. They knew how troublesome and hazardous Trotsky's popularity had been to them and Stalin in their climb to the summit of power. This popularity was still a stumbling block in Stalin's path. Zinoviev deemed it possible to turn Trotsky's personal prestige to their own advantage. Two years later, having been ejected by Stalin from the Party, realizing that their paltry scheme had proved a failure, Zinoviev and Kamenev dropped Trotsky like a hot coal and crawled on their bellies before Stalin.

In answer to a reproach for having left Trotsky in the lurch, Kamenev, according to Trotsky's friend, Rakovsky, made a brutal admission of the aim he and Zinoviev had had in mind when aligning themselves with Trotsky. In a letter written in August 1928 Rakovsky said: "They came over to the Opposition, hoping to gain power in a short lapse of time. Towards this end they joined with the 1923 Opposition. When somebody from the 'group without leaders' reproached Zinoviev and Kamenev for having left their ally Trotsky in the lurch, Kamenev replied: 'We needed Trotsky to govern; for getting back into the party, he is dead weight.' " (*New Int.* Nov. 1934, 109)

These factional speculators were governed not by proletarian principles but solely by the sense of burocratic self-preservation.

2. *Trotsky Alters His Tactic*

There is no deep mystery as to why Trotsky united with the two former members of the Trio. To continue the policy of "political holiday" was patently tantamount to slow suicide. A fresh attempt at a show of resistance was necessary since all attempts at conciliation had proved worse than futile and Stalin's persecution continued unabated. Without touching the roots of the Stalinists policies, carefully hiding his support to them, Trotsky could easily pick some surface feature of these policies and "criticise" it. He had done so in 1923, and Zinoviev and Kamenev had resorted to the same tactic at the Fourteenth Congress, with the difference that Trotksy had done his "criticising" behind the stage.

The split-up of the Trio gave a two fold impetus to Trotsky's new tactic. Here was a chance to form a mutual protective association

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

against Stalin with two relatively big figures. In addition, since it was Zinoviev and Kamenev primarily who had concocted the factional target of "Trotskyism" and had been in the forefront of the anti-Trotsky drive, it seemed that unity with them would deal the myth of "Trotskyism" a powerful blow. However, Trotsky for a moment faced a certain difficulty in his own camp where there was a division on the question of unity with Zinoviev and Kamenev. "Little wonder that in our midst rapprochement with Zinoviev and Kamenev seemed, to say the least, paradoxical. There were even some, true only a few, who thought it possible to form a bloc with Stalin against Zinoviev and Kamenev." (*My Life,* II, 264-5)

The proposal to unite with Stalin came from those who evidently had not yet completely discarded the earlier hope to win Stalin away from Zinoviev and Kamenev (*Lessons of October*). Stalin's shrewd tactic of disseminating a rumor on the eve of the Fourteenth Congress that a possibility would open up for a Stalin-Trotsky bloc contributed to this illusory proposal. One can readily grasp how "anti-Stalinist" was Trotsky's inner circle if there could be found within its midst people who proposed joining hands factionally with Stalin as late as 1926!

However, Stalin's machine continued to bear down heavily upon Trotsky, compelling Trotsky's group to decide in favor of banding together with Zinoviev and Kamenev, leaving no other course even for those who advocated a combination with Stalin.

3. *A Burocratic Family Wrangle*

Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev rounded out their bloc by including remnants of former opposition groups, the Workers Opposition headed by Medvedev and Shliapnikov, the Democratic Centralists and the Georgian opponents of Stalin. Some of them harbored a bitter aversion to Trotsky, but their entry into the bloc was a case of practical compatibility: they all dreaded Stalin. In July 1926, behind the scenes at the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, the leaders of the Opposition Bloc put their new line into execution. The records of the proceedings remained a closed book. Gradually a few facts did emerge. Zinoviev and Trotsky had altered their previous views about each other in formal statements to the Plenum. Zinoviev declared that the 1923 Opposition had been correct in warning "of the dangers of the deviation from the proletarian line and of the menacing growth of the apparatus regime." He repudiated his attacks upon Trotsky and the 1923 Opposition, and set himself "right" by uniting with Trotsky. This, of course, did not stop Zinoviev a year and a half later from making another recantation "correcting" the "correction" he made at the July 1926 Plenum and resuming the hounding of Trotsky.

Trotsky, too, indulged in "revolutionary" self-criticism at the Plenum stating that his attack upon Zinoviev and Kamenev in the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lessons of October had been an error. The ruling clique enjoyed the ludicrous spectacle of this mutual whitewashing very much. Three months after the Plenum Stalin publicly ridiculed the leaders of the Opposition Bloc:

"Here is what Comrade Zinoviev said in July of this year: 'We say that at present there can no longer be any doubt that the main nucleus of the Opposition of 1923 as has been verified in the evolution of the leading policy of the faction (i.e., of the Majority of the Central Committee), *correctly forewarned* of the danger of deviation from the proletarian line and of the menacing growth of the regime of the apparatus.' In other words: the recent declarations of Comrade Zinoviev and the Resolution of the Thirteenth Congress stating that Trotsky is revising Leninism and that Trotskyism is a petty-bourgeois deviation—all that was a mistake, a misunderstanding, and the danger is not from Trotskyism but from the Central Committee. This is the most unprincipled 'amnesty' of Trotskyism. On the other side, Trotsky declared in July: 'There is no doubt that in "Lessons of October" I associated the opportunist deviations in policy with the names of Zinoviev and Kamenev. As the experience of the ideological struggle in the Central Committee indicates, that was a crude error. The explanation of that error is to be found in the fact that I had no means of following up the ideological struggle within the Septemvirate and to establish in time that the opportunist deviations were caused by the group headed by Comrade Stalin against Comrades Zinoviev and Kamenev.' This means that Comrade Trotsky openly repudiated his sensational 'Lessons of October,' and by this very act returned the 'amnesty' which he received from Zinoviev and Kamenev. A clear and open unprincipled deal." (*Pravda,* Nov. 5, 1926)

To impress the Stalin burocrats, the Opposition circulated among them copies of Lenin's anti-Stalin documents. Many of Stalin's close supporters were not acquainted with the authentic texts, so they called upon the General Secretary, who possessed most of the orginal copies, to read them for the purpose of verifying what Lenin had really said about him. At first Stalin strove to avoid the distasteful task. In the end he yielded, not wishing to wound the feelings of his own crowd. Many years later Trotsky recalled the occasion:

"At that plenum also secret manuscripts were read, among them the testament. This time Stalin did actually read them, and not Kamenev who was then already sitting beside me in the opposition benches. The reading was provoked by the fact that during those days copies of the testament, the national letter of Lenin, and other documents kept under lock and key, were already circulating rather broadly in the party. The party apparatus was getting nervous, and wanted to find out what it was that Lenin actually said. 'The Opposition knows and we don't know,' they were saying. After prolonged resistance Stalin found himself compelled to read the forbidden documents at a session of the Central Committee—thus automatically bring-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ing them into the stenographic record, printed in secret notebooks for the heads of the party apparatus." (*Sup. Test.* 35)

Although the Stalin stooges were presented with evidence of Lenin's hostile attitude toward Stalin, the reading of the secret documents constituted no danger to him. There was no force anywhere to bring the entire truth to the proletariat. All the participants in the Plenum were hardened burocrats. Everyone of these men, from Stalin, Voroshilov and Ordjonikidze to Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, engaged in their burocratic family wrangle, kept a sharp, uneasy eye upon the workers outside.

If the Stalin and the Opposition cliques fully succeeded in keeping the reading of Lenin's documents from the workers, they failed to prevent the Menshevik snoopers from discovering this unsavory fact. Basing itself upon confidential information from Moscow, the Menshevik paper in Berlin printed a story entitled "The Twilight of the Gods." Here is an interesting excerpt:

"It is self-understood that in the heat of the mutual struggle both sides would not let go of the coat-tails of the departed Ilyich. Into the light of day were dragged out Lenin's last articles and letters up to this day not published in the Communist press; his correspondence with Trotsky on the national question, his 'Testament' and other documents, parts of which were printed in the 'Sotsialisticheskiy Vestnik.' Since the majority of the participants in the plenum were not acquainted with these documents, the opposition demanded that their content be revealed. For some reason the documents were read by Stalin, and here was unfolded a real Gogol comedy! When Stalin began to read Lenin's Testament in which were given the characterizations of the leading members of the Central Committee, and reached the part where Lenin spoke of Stalin, he choked and said: 'Well, you already know all that.' But the Opposition stormily insisted that he read further, and poor Stalin was compelled to read to the end the unflattering characterization which Ilyich gave him. A scene worthy of the brush of Aivasovsky. It follows as a matter of course that the revengeful Georgian will never forgive either Trotsky or Zinoviev." (*Sots. Vest.* August 25, 1926)

"Kamenev went still further. He not only announced that he retracted all his former attacks against Trotsky and 'Trotskyism' but even told the following piquant little story: it turns out that in 1923, at the time of struggle against Trotsky, meetings of the majority of the Politburo were often held (i.e. without Trotsky). And at one of these fractional meetings it was decided to create, for demagogic purposes, the bogie of 'Trotskyism,' as a special 'semi-Menshevik' heresy, and use this bugbear to frighten the mass Communist simpleton and to undermine the influence of Trotsky." (*Ib.*)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Stalin Wields the Organizational Axe*

Following the secret wrangling at the July Plenum the Stalin clique went after the Opposition with a vengeance.

Zinoviev was removed from the Politburo. Kamenev was eliminated from the leadership in the Moscow Soviet. Lashevich was ousted from the Control Committee and from the post of Assistant Commissar of War. Thousands of workers supporters of the Opposition were deprived of jobs and left destitute.

But if Stalin had a free and easy way with Zinoviev and many secondary leaders and rank and file of the Opposition, he was not at all reckless with Trotsky. Although the popularity of the organizer of the October Insurrection and the Red Army wore a semi-legal character and by official version had dwindled immensely, it was vast enough to compel Stalin to wait with Trotsky's dismissal from the Politburo.

In consequence no immediate organizational measures were taken against him. Rykov covered up the true reason: "But since Comrade Trotsky did not undertake splitting steps of such nature, therefore, in spite the fact that the disagreements between the party and Comrade Trotsky are more serious, the same measures were not applied against him as were taken by the last Plenum with regard to Comrade Zinoviev." (*Pravda,* August 1, 1926)

The undermining of Trotsky continued however. In September 1926 he was quietly removed from the Supreme Economic Council, and for the time being Stalin did not deem it wise to go beyond that action.

5. *The October 1926 "Insurrection" of the Opposition Leaders*

Fully realizing that they were being steadily pushed towards the abyss, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and their henchmen decided upon a desperate move—to bring their camouflage issues directly to the rank-and-file. They would merely introduce such innocent topics as the impossibility of completing Socialism in Russia, the tempo of industrialization, the Kulak danger and other issues, circumventing the crux of the Stalin problem. Like a drowning man grasping at a straw, they calculated that Stalin would see he was driving them to the courage of despair and would relent in his persecution.

On the 30th of September 1926 the leaders of the Opposition put their fortune to the test. Addressing the members of the Riazano-Ural Railroad unit of the Party, Trotsky broached a "criticism" of the line of Stalin's Central Committee. Next day the leaders of the Opposition made a great sortie. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Piatakov, Smilga and Radek came in a body to the Party unit of the Aviopribor Plant in Moscow and presented arguments for launching a Party discussion. But Stalin was ready for them. As if by the press of a button, his machine moved forth with a furious momentum. Wherever the Oppo-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sition speakers attempted to open a discussion, rowdies met them with an uproar and abuse. This was a far different situation from 1923 when the Moscow Opposition had the backing of half the Party, with a majority in the Moscow organization. Now, owing to the continuous application of the tactic employed during the Leninist Levy and the hounding of the Opposition workers, the overwhelming majority was with Stalin. The Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc was rudely rebuffed, in many instances by the honest rank-and-file.

The following day *Pravda* and other papers opened a campaign of violent denunciation of Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and the rest of the Oppositionists. The general cry was "No discussion in the Party," "The Party wants Socialist work not empty babbling." Letters, statements, resolutions, articles covered the pages of *Pravda* and other publications, all expressing condemnation of the Opposition. One Stalinist described the appearance of Trotsky at the Aviopribor: "Much was expected from the leader of the Opposition but in reality it turned out to be a lot of chatter. Trotsky could say nothing constructive on industrialization. He merely said that the problems are 'tremendous' and 'important', and have to be discussed, and for that a discussion must be opened in the entire Party. He 'soft-soaped,' 'praised' everybody to the right and to the left, praised all the leaders of the Opposition: that's who they are—old Bolsheviks! But how long is it since he abused these same old Bolsheviks and reminded them of their October errors? It seems that now 'the cuckoo praises the cock because the cock praises the cuckoo.' How long ago was it that Comrade Trotsky showed himself to be a 'soldier of the Party' knowing how to stand at attention? This old Trotsky now could not be seen at the meeting of the nuclei of 'Aviopribor.'" (K-ov, *Pravda,* Oct. 3, 1926)

In a few brief days the "campaign" of the Opposition collapsed like a pricked baloon. Through the heavy pressure of Stalin's machine, unit after unit in the All-Russian Communist Party voted to condemn the Opposition.

6. *The Leaders of the Opposition Plead Guilty*

Trotsky and the other leaders of the Opposition ignominiously announced their abject surrender in their historic "Declaration of October 16, 1926." Here are the basic portions of this Declaration:

"We call for the immediate dissolution of all factional groupings which have been formed round the views of the Opposition. At the same time we admit that by our appearance in Moscow and in Leningrad in October we violated the decision of the Central Committee . . . We emphatically condemn such a criticism of the Comintern or the policy of our Party which goes over to incitement, which weakens the position of the Comintern as the fighting organization of the international proletariat, of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

outpost of the Comintern, or of the Soviet Union as the first State of the proletarian dictatorship . . .

"We emphatically deny the right of those who carry on an agitation of *any sort* against the Comintern, the C.P. of the Soviet Union or the Soviet Union, to lay claim to any solidarity with us . . . We consider the decision of the XIV Party Congress of the Central Committee and of the Central Control Commission as absolutely binding for us, and we shall *unconditionally* submit to them and carry them out. We call upon all comrades who share our views to do the same." (*Pravda,* October 17. *Inprecor,* No. 68, 1926, 1173. Our emph.—G.S.)

A sorry sight before the entire world, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev made a servile declaration of repentance submitting *unconditionally* to Stalin's discipline and to the decisions of Stalin's burocratic assemblies. They parted with the lesser groups in the Bloc and emphatically disavowed and condemned any exposure, at home or abroad, of the Stalin gang.

7. *Some Information in the Bourgeois Press*

Outside Russia the world was buzzing about the extraordinary political events in the Bolshevik Party. On October 18, 1926, two days after Trotsky and his allies issued the Declaration, *The New York Times* printed alongside of the report from its Moscow correspondent, Walter Duranty, an article by Max Eastman which contained Lenin's Testament. The editors of the newspaper introduced the article with a brief note:

"Max Eastman, author of the article printed below, is the former editor of The Masses who went to Russia in 1922 and stayed until the Spring of 1924. He was engaged in writing a biography of Trotsky when Lenin died and Trotsky was removed from power. Eastman left Russia and wrote a book called 'Since Lenin Died,' in which he exposed the conspiracy of the 'Triumvirate' which eliminated Trotsky, and quoted among other secret documents a so-called 'testament' of Lenin. The book was violently denounced by the official Communist parties and press all over the world. In particular they denied the existence of any 'testament' of Lenin, or any conspiracy to humiliate Trotsky.

"In this article, written abroad before the news of Trotsky's surrender came, Eastman answers his critics with the authentic text of the 'testament' of Lenin, and a statement signed by Zinoviev and Kamenev themselves admitting that there was such a secret organization against Trotsky as he described in his book. He also describes the fight for control and the results of a Stalin victory."

Eastman however withheld the fact that not only the Stalin official gang but also Trotsky had denounced Eastman's book and denied the validity of the exposure and the existence of the Testament.

From the text of the Testament the reader could see that Lenin's policy was to remove Stalin from control of the Bolshevik Party.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

At the same time it was made obvious that Lenin did not propose to remove Trotsky from the post of War Commissar or from any position the man occupied in the Party.

As a contrast to Lenin's policy embodied in the Testament ran Duranty's report of the actual developments. A big headline announced: "Trotsky Admits Defeat. Bows to Stalin Group as the Real Red Chiefs." A few crisp subheads presented the highlights of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev wretched surrender: "Confess Errors Publicly," "Repudiate Allies Abroad," "Foreign Communists Who Depended on Them for Support are Cast Adrift."

In the "confession of errors" by Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev in 1926, the pattern of the "confessions" at the Moscow Trials ten years later is easily recognizable.

Regarding the reaction among the Russian leaders to the printing of the Testament, Walter Duranty cabled from Moscow:

"It is interesting to speculate on what has been the effect of the recent publication by *The New York Times* of the Lenin Testament articles. There has been no press comment whatsoever and both sides in the struggle are characteristically reticent. At first sight it might appear to injure Trotsky as being a maneuver inspired by him. His friends declare that nothing is more untrue. His opponents are said to have the same opinion. Neither considers that it vitally concerns the present issue." (*N.Y.T.* Oct. 22, 1926)

By continuous silence concerning the Testament, Trotsky made it understood that he rested on his statement of 1925 that all talk about the Testament "is a despicable lie." Trotsky thus defeated another attempt by Eastman to draw the workers' attention to Lenin's line for the removal of Stalin from power. As in the case of the Mensheviks publishing Lenin's anti-Stalin documents, the contradiction produced by the dishonesty of Stalin, Trotsky, Zinoviev and all the other leaders of the Bolshevik Party was once again recorded by history. The capitalist press told the proletariat the truth about Lenin's line against Stalin; but Trotsky, claiming to be the authentic representative of the proletariat, continued criminally and dastardly withholding the truth from the workers. At the July 1926 Plenum of the Central Committee, in the midst of the biggest careerists, Trotsky insisted that Lenin's exact words be read. (*Sup. Test.* 37). That was perfectly safe. But it was not safe for Trotsky, who only a little over a year before openly and flatly had denied the very existence of Lenin's Testament, and it was not safe for his allies Zinoviev and Kamenev who had aided Stalin to suppress it, to reveal it at that time to the workers. Its existence could be acknowledged only when this acknowledgement did not carry the threat of the proletarian overthrow of the Stalin regime.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

8. *Stalin Effects a "Truce"—for a Day!*

Concerning the declaration of October 16, Trotsky in his autobiography leads one to imagine that he and his allies retained some sort of right to advocate their "views" "within the framework of the Party" (II, 274). Few things are further from fact. The Declaration of October 16, 1926 recognized Stalin's right to bring down upon their head the full weight of Ordjonikidze's disciplinary club if any one of them dared to utter a word of disagreement with Stalin's Central Committee. On the day Trotsky and his colleagues submitted their Declaration Stalin made a gesture of forgiveness and appeared to have decided to desist from further attacks: "The Central Committee considers that that minimum which was required to insure the unity of the Party can be regarded as achieved." (*Pravda,* Oct. 17, 1926) But the leaders of the Opposition did not lull themselves with the sense of false security. Even the Menshevik paper in Berlin understood that neither the hunter nor the quarry in the Stalinist game was sincere. "Upon the capitulation of Trotsky and upon the kind forgiveness of Stalin lies the stamp of deep insincerity." (Nov. 1, 1926). And indeed, "the Stalinists began to break the truce the day after it was concluded." *(My Life,* II, 274)

9. *Declaration of October 16 Trotsky's Last Refuge*

At the XV Conference of the Bolshevik Party in October 1926 the Stalin clique, as evidence of its adherence to democracy, permitted the leaders of the Opposition to defend themselves against the accusation that their "views" were a Social-Democratic deviation. Zinoviev explained at the Conference that the leaders of the Opposition had consulted the Stalin leaders on the question of taking the floor and apologetically informed everybody that had no permission been granted they would have refrained from speaking: "At the joint session of the Central Committee and Central Control Committee we openly, frankly and comradely asked whether we should come out at the Conference with an explanation regarding the accusation of the 'Social Democratic deviation.' And if the comrades of the Central Committee and Central Control Committee had said that in the interest of the Party we should not do so, we would not have done so." (*Pravda,* Nov. 9, 1926)

Stalin had nothing to fear and much to gain in allowing the Opposition leaders to speak at the Conference. At this stage of Stalin's personal power he still required that the Opposition workers harbor the feeling that their leaders were fighting against the official policy. Moreover, allowing Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and other leaders of the Opposition to speak was a show of Party democracy to deceive the rank-and-file supporters of the Stalin faction.

Having sunk to the level of the Declaration of October 16, the leadership of the Opposition Bloc attempted to call Stalin's atten-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tion to the advantages the Declaration held for his Central Committee: "From this Declaration arises the obligation to refrain from such methods of defending our points of view which could be interpreted as attacks on the Central Committee of that Party which embodies the dictatorship of the proletariat in the only country building Socialism." (Kamenev, *Pravda,* Nov. 5, 1926). Kamenev supported the lie that Socialism was being built in Russia. Did Trotsky share his view? Trotsky took the floor and performed a difficult verbal trick. On the one hand he agreed that Stalin was building Socialism; on the other hand, for the first time, he attempted to "question" publicly the theory of Socialism in one country. By resorting to such an obviously contradictory maneuver Trotsky made himself look ridiculous: "That we are building Socialism—correct; that we will build it hand in hand with the world proletariat—indisputable. (Laughter). I think that it is wrong to laugh at a conference of a Communist Party when the building of Socialism (Sic!—G.S.) hand in hand with the world proletariat is being discussed. (Laughter. Voices: 'Don't indulge in demagogy. You can't catch us on this.'). But I say that at a turtle's pace we'll never build Socialism, for we are more and more strictly controlled by the world market." (*Pravda,* Nov. 6, 1926). Supporting the Stalin fraud "we are building Socialism," Trotsky reduced the issue to the question of tempo, obscuring the fact that the Stalin regime was building not Socialism but a kind of a concentration camp for the Russian masses.

Enjoying the verbal exercises of the Opposition leaders the Stalin faction presented a resolution which contained the thinly-veiled demand that the Opposition debase itself still further, that it completely renounce all its "views" and capitulate fully, unconditionally and unreservedly. This was one of the purposes of the whole performance —to drive the Opposition from its October 16 "refuge." Feeling he must hang on to his "views" as a means of identity as an "oppositionist" Trotsky replied to this new pressure with a grand flourish that he and his partners would not retreat further than the Declaration: "The adoption of this resolution will not move us from the line of October 16. We do not accept views which are forced upon us. We have no intention of artificially widening or sharpening the differences and thus preparing the recrudescence of fractionalism. On the contrary every one of us without minimizing the differences—they exist—will exert all efforts to confine these differences within the framework of uninterrupted work in mutual responsibility for the policy of the Party." (*Pravda,* Nov. 6, 1926)

For the time being the political situation rested at this point. Thus, from the colorful opportunist dream in 1922-1923 of maintaining his power on a "collective" basis, towering over all the conspirators, Trotsky, caught short in the crooked scheme, went through a kaleidoscopic descent. Politically discredited as a Social-Democratic deviator, pushed out of power, Trotsky tried to maintain at least the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"right" to hold mutely to his "views." In return for this "right" he eagerly offered to work for Stalin and share the responsibility for Stalin's policy. Beside Trotsky stood his allies, Zinoviev and Kamenev, also caught in their ambitious scheme. The three now found themselves facing a vast solitude in a heated factional atmosphere.

CHAPTER XV.

TROTSKY'S THEORY OF PERMANENT REVOLUTION

1. *Lenin's Formula*

HAVING ABANDONED the hopeless strategy of opening a discussion in the Party on superficial and fabricated questions, the leaders of the Opposition Bloc now resorted to forging a theoretical shield against Stalin's blows. Since Zinoviev and Kamenev, due primarily to their recent anti-Trotskyism, were infinitely more vulnerable than their senior partner in the Bloc, their need for protection was the greater. Trotsky furnished them with the protection they required in a manipulation involving his theory of Permanent Revolution.

In order to make the nature of his act clear, it is necessary to review the historical role Trotsky's Permanent Revolution occupied in the Russian Marxist movement.

On the eve of the Revolution of 1905, Lenin and other eminent Russian Socialist leaders attempted to outline theoretically the character of the forthcoming revolution and the position various classes would assume in the struggle and in the construction of a revolutionary government. Lenin's theoretical concept, presented in the work *Two Tactics of the Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution* and in the article *Social Democracy and the Provisional Government,* was summed up in his phrase "Revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." Lenin defined this form as distinct from the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

In 1906 Lenin actually inserted into his agrarian program the false idea that the peasantry would seize power: "The following remarks of Plekhanov concern the question of seizure of power. Plekhanov found the seizure of power in my projected agrarian program and I must say that the idea of seizure of power by the revolutionary peasantry is certainly contained in my project on the agrarian program." *(Col. W.* VII, R. I. 158)

Erroneously believing in the possibility of the simultaneous rule of two different social classes, Lenin overemphasized the political function of the peasantry: "But how is a successful peasant revolution possible without the seizure of power by the revolutionary peasantry? Plekhanov talked himself into an absurdity. Having hit an incline he is rolling down irresistibly. At first he denies the possibility of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

seizure of power by the proletariat in a contemporary revolution. Now he denies the possibility of seizure of power by the revolutionary peasantry in a contemporary revolution." (197). "But fear of seizure of power by the revolutionary peasantry is a purely Kadet fear of the peasant revolution." (240)

Indeed, so profound was Lenin's error that he imagined that not the proletarian but the *peasant* revolution would become the central power: "The peasant agrarian revolution of which you speak, gentlemen, must, in order to triumph as such, as a peasant revolution, become the central power of the whole State." (IX, R. 539). The overestimation of the political weight of the peasantry lingered in Lenin's mind for over a decade. Even in 1917 upon his arrival in Petrograd after the overthrow of the Tsar, Lenin believed that—"It is possible that the peasantry may seize all the land and the entire power." (*S. W.* XI, 36)

Two years later, however, Lenin wrote the absolutely correct statement about the peasantry—a position totally different from his early views:

"The peasant in his economic situation in bourgeois society is unavoidably put in such a position that he either follows the worker or the bourgeoisie." "If one has learned anything at all, the entire political enonomy, the entire history of revolution, the entire history of political development within the whole Nineteenth Century teaches us that the peasant follows either the worker or the bourgeoisie. He is incapable of any other step." (XVI, R. 217, 219)

Lenin's unrealistic view that the peasantry would seize the entire power was simply a carryover from his old utopian formula of "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." In 1917 he had already discarded the formula, but he still imagined that due to preponderant numbers the peasants could play an impossible role and seize the entire power.

Thus, prior to 1917, advancing a policy for a middle-of-the-road position, Lenin in reality stood on the ground of the bourgeois State. Trotsky correctly wrote the following over a decade after the Bolshevik Revolution: "But up to 1917 the thought of Lenin himself remained bound to the traditional concept of 'bourgeois' revolution." (Intr. to *Tragedy of the Chinese Rev.* by H. R. Isaaks, xix)

2. *The Menshevik Position*

While Lenin up to April 1917 stood on an inconsistently left bourgeois position, the Mensheviks, to the Right of him, presented a consistent line for a Liberal bourgeois regime. Russia was pregnant with a bourgeois revolution, they declared, therefore the leadership in that revolution belonged to the Liberal bourgeoisie whom the proletariat must support. The Mensheviks trailed the bourgeoisie prior to and during the World War though the bourgeoisie supported the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Tsar. They trailed the bourgeoisie in the revolutionary period of 1917, throughout the Civil War and after. Their theoretical framework excluded Lenin's utopian idea of a "democratic republic" under the "revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." Their consistent ideal was a bourgeois republic ruled by the bourgeoisie.

3. *Trotsky's Position*

Paradoxically, while Trotsky constantly pulled to the Right of Lenin organizationally, denouncing the Bolsheviks for their split with the Mensheviks, organizing blocs with the Mensheviks against Lenin, on the perspective of the forthcoming Russian revolution he was to the Left of Lenin. Sharply opposed to the Menshevik aspirations of establishing a bourgeois republic, Trotsky at the same time uncompromisingly rejected Lenin's thesis: "I came out against the formula: 'democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry,' because I saw its shortcoming in the fact that it left open the question of what class the real dictatorship would belong to." (Intr. to *Perm. Rev.* xxix)

Trotsky argued that since the proletariat would be the leader in the struggle, the power after the revolutionary victory would not be a dictatorship of *two* classes, but of *one* class, the *proletariat,* supported by the peasantry. Writing in 1905 Trotsky succinctly stated: "It is self-understood that the proletariat, as in its time the bourgeoisie, fulfills its mission supported upon the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie. The proletariat leads the village, draws it into the movement, interests it in the success of its plans. The proletariat, however, absolutely remains the leader. This is not the 'dictatorship of the peasantry and proletariat' but the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the peasantry." *(1905,* 281; *P. R.* 50)

The story assiduously broadcast many years later by the Stalinist Comintern that Lenin was correct and Trotsky wrong in estimating the peasantry must be dismissed as a crafty invention. As a matter of fact, the direct opposite is true. For a long time Lenin definitely *overestimated* the political character of the peasantry.

Counterposing his theoretical perspective to those of the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks, Trotsky clearly perceived the dangers to the revolution threatening from these two camps. Trotsky expressed this understanding of Lenin's thesis in 1909 in the Polish journal of Rosa Luxemburg:

"If the Mensheviks, starting from the abstraction 'Our revolution is a bourgeois revolution,' arrive at the idea of adapting the whole tactic of the proletariat to the conduct of the liberal bourgeoisie, even to the point of a conquest by it of the state power, then the Bolsheviks, starting from an equally bare abstraction 'a democratic and not a socialist dictatorship,' will arrive at the idea of a bourgeois

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

democratic self-limitation of the proletariat in whose hands the government power will be found. To be sure, the difference between them on this question is very considerable: while the anti-revolutionary sides of Menshevism are expressed in their full strength even now, the anti-revolutionary traits of Bolshevism threaten a great danger only in the case of a revolutionary victory." *(H. of R. R.* I, Appendix II, 476-477)

Trotsky summarized his theoretical perspective for the Russian revolution under the phrase: the theory of *Permanent Revolution.*

Trotsky's theory met with fierce opposition from all quarters. The Mensheviks denounced it as a fantastic leap over the bourgeois revolution. Among the Bolsheviks the prevailing view was that Trotsky grossly underestimated and even disregarded the peasantry and tried to skip the bourgeois-democratic stage of the Russian revolution. On a number of occasions Lenin crossed polemical swords with Trotsky on the perspective of the revolution in Russia. In May 1914 Lenin termed Trotsky's theory ". . . absurdly-Left 'permanent revolution.' "

4. *Trotsky's Permanent Revolution Concretized in Russia*

In February 1917 a stupendous social and political storm occurred in Russia. In the volcanic situation which followed the various theoretical views were tested. The Mensheviks without delay established a "Provisional Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers Deputies." Acting as a directing body the Committee summoned the workers of Petrograd to elect deputies to the Soviet. The Soviet delegates assembled in a palace of the overthrown Tsar and, dominated by the Mensheviks, proceeded to function as the sovereign authority.

Meanwhile, a few political leaders of the impotent bourgeoisie formed a "Provisional Committee of Members of the Duma." This body met in a wing of the same palace.

Since the Mensheviks held the view that power must rest in the hands of the bourgeoisie, the leaders of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet came before the Duma Committee and urged that it establish itself as the power of the revolution. The bourgeois leaders grasped the life-preserver thrown to them by the Mensheviks, who enjoyed the confidence of the masses, and formed a "Provisional Government." At one stroke the workers were deprived of their victory. Through the Menshevik-controlled Petrograd Soviet, which was connected to the Provisional Government by a transmission belt called the "Contact Committee," the revolutionary masses were chained to the bourgeoisie.

While Lenin, still abroad, formulated a line of struggle, the Bolshevik Party, guided at first by Shliapnikov and Molotov and then by Stalin and Kamenev, was not engaged in a struggle for power. Quite the opposite. When the Mensheviks handed the power to the bourgeoisie, the Bolshevik leadership assured the rule of the bour-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

geoisie by rendering "critical" support to the Provisional Government. The hopelessly contradictory position of the Bolshevik leadership was expressed by Stalin at the Bolshevik Conference on March 29, 1917: "In so far as the Provisional Government fortifies the steps of the revolution, to that extent we must support it; but, in so far as it is counter-revolutionary, support to the Provisional Government is not permissible."

Trotsky's prediction that the "anti-revolutionary traits of Bolshevism threaten only in the case of a revolutionary victory" was borne out. Of the 39 members of the Executive Committee of the Petrograd Soviet, over one fourth stood with the Bolsheviks. On the Menshevik-Socialist Revolutionist proposition to sustain the power of the bourgeoisie not a single discordant voice was raised by the Bolshevik representatives. In the Soviet itself the Bolshevik faction split, only a minority opposing the power of the bourgeoisie. The sentiment among the Bolshevik workers was pronouncedly in favor of deposing the Provisional Government and placing power in the hands of the Soviet. The Bolshevik functionaries and workers of the Vyborg borough of Petrograd held huge mass meetings. A resolution for establishing the power of the Soviet was adopted. But the higher leaders of the Bolshevik Party rejected this resolution, and the Vyborg section submitted to the pre-1917 Lenin line of Stalin and Kamenev. In the hands of Stalin and Kamenev the old utopian line caused many of the Bolshevik rank and file to rebel against the leadership and demand that the editors of *Pravda,* that is Stalin and his assistants, be expelled from the Party (Shliapnikov, *The Year 1917,* II. Published in 1925). No action was taken against Stalin only because there was no organized expression of this resentment.

On the 4 of March 1917 the Bolsheviks in the Soviet voted for a Menshevik manifesto of a pro-Allied imperialist character. At the March-April All-Russian Conference of 82 Soviets, Stalin, Kamenev and other Bolsheviks gave their support to the Mensheviks and SRs on the question of power. The Menshevik-SR resolution contained the significant words "not to hamper the Provisional Government," which boldly expressed the bourgeois line of the resolution. At a conference of the Moscow Soviet the Bolsheviks supported the Menshevik-SR resolution on the war question.

5. *Trotsky Applying the "Permanent Revolution"*

Trotsky was in New York when the monarchy was overthrown in Russia. Viewing the news in the light of his old theory Trotsky formulated a political line for the Russian masses which was in marked contrast to the policies of the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks in Russia. Writing in the New York Russian Socialist paper, *Novy Mir,* Trotsky declared that the Russian proletariat must immediately set

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

up the Soviets in opposition to the Provisional Government and must undertake the struggle for power.

6. *Lenin's New Position*

Following the overthrow of the Romanov monarchy, Lenin, in Switzerland, outlined a program of action for the Russian proletariat. If he had conformed with his previous theory he would have called outright for the creation of a "revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry." But he now definitely shifted the emphasis to the proletariat, although he did repeat this old formula in his "Letters from Afar."

Outlining a policy of keeping the revolutionary workers from political and organizational entanglements with Menshevism and of unconditional antagonism to the Provisional Government, Lenin insisted that the only way out of war, hunger and oppression was a workers' government. A member of the Petrograd Committee of the Bolshevik Party, Zaslavsky, wrote later about Lenin's presentation of his April Thesis: "On that day (April 4) Comrade Lenin could not find open sympathizers even in our own ranks." Lenin threatened to split the Party: "You, comrades, have faith in the government. In that case our ways must part. I would rather be in the minority." (Speech at the Caucus of Bolsheviks, *C. W.* XX, Bk I, 98)

Led by Kamenev, with Stalin maintaining a watchful silence, the Bolshevik leaders attacked Lenin's position. On the day after the publication of Lenin's theses, Kamenev, in an article "Our Differences," defended the policy he and Stalin were conducting: "As regards Comrade Lenin's general line, it appears to us unacceptable inasmuch as it proceeds from the assumption that the bourgeois-democratic revolution *has been completed* and it builds on the immediate transformation of this revolution into a Socialist revolution." *(Pravda,* April 21, 1917; Bk II, 381)

7. *Bolshevism Incorporates Trotsky's "Permanent Revolution"*

Trotsky arrived in Petrograd in May 1917, about a month after Lenin. By then the fight in the Bolshevik Party had terminated with Lenin victorious and a consequent sharp reversal of the Bolshevik policy. Lenin and the "Old Bolsheviks" had been violently antagonistic to Trotsky. But their attitude toward him changed abruptly in accordance with the change in their entire perspective and policy.

Trotsky discovered that he and Lenin stood on the same political platform: "From the earlier days of my arrival, I stated first to comrade Kamenev, afterward to the editorial board of *Pravda,* in the presence of Lenin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, that I was ready to join the Bolshevik organization immediately in view of the absence of any disagreement . . ." *(Stalin School,* 6)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

But how could Trotsky join the Bolshevik Party without renouncing his "absurdly-Leftist Permanent Revolution," as Lenin had previously branded Trotsky's theory? The fact is that nobody asked him to renounce it, and for an obvious reason. From the moment Lenin and the Party had undergone a political change, Bolshevism became Leninism minus "democratic dictatorship" and plus Trotsky's Permanent Revolution. "The only difference between Trotskyism and Leninism to be found at that time was in the Party tops where they accused *Lenin* of Trotskyism during the month of April. Kamenev did this openly and with great insistence. Others—more cautiously, behind the scenes. Many 'old Bolsheviks' said to me after I arrived in Russia: 'Now the celebration is on *your street.*'" *(My Life,* II, 53)

Not only the Bolsheviks but even the Mensheviks, who had witnessed or participated in the theoretical disputes over the prognosis of the Russian Revolution, declared at once that Trotsky's line had won out over Lenin's. Moisaye J. Olgin, for many years a Right Menshevik, later a Stalinist burocrat, wrote in 1918: "Whatever our attitude toward the course of events in 1917 revolution may be, we must admit that, in the main, this course has taken the direction predicted in Trotsky's essays. There is a labor dictatorship now in Russia. It is a *labor* dictatorship not a 'dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasants.'" (Notes to Trotsky's *Our Revolution,* 66). We see that Olgin referred pointedly to Lenin's utopian formula by setting it off with quotation marks to emphasize its incorrectness. Describing the course of the revolution, Olgin added: "All this had been outlined by Trotsky twelve years ago."

Another Stalinist, former Menshevik leader, Martinov, who in the pre-October years had attacked Trotsky's theoretical perspective, wrote in a Stalinist publication: "L. Trotsky in 1905 argued more logically and consistently than either the Bolsheviks or the Mensheviks." *(Krasnaya Nov,* 1923, No. 2, 262)

And even as late as 1924, after Lenin's death, one could read in *Pravda* a statement that the World War made possible in Russia the establishment of precisely what Trotsky had said would develop: "The war created an abyss between the peasants (who were yearning for land and peace) and the petty-bourgeois parties; the war brought the peasant under the leadership of the working class and its vanguard, the Party of the Bolsheviks. Then the possibility arose of establishing, not the dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry, but the dictatorship of the working class supported by the peasantry. The theory which Rosa Luxemburg and Trotsky put forth against Lenin in 1905 (the theory of Permanent Revolution) became, in actual fact, the second stage of historical development." *(Pravda,* Feb. 21, 1924). The above passage was written by Radek. As far as we have been able to ascertain, there was not a single official word of refutation of the statement. It must be remembered that the campaign against Trotsky

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was already in full swing, having begun in 1923. Yet Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev evidently thought it inadvisable at that stage to make a public assualt on the principle of Permanent Revolution. It was only in the Fall of 1924 that the Trio opened fire against Trotsky's Permanent Revolution: "In 1924, that is, seven years after the historical prognosis of the theory of the permanent revolution was confirmed with rare force, the epigones opened up a wild attack against this theory . . ." (Trotsky, *Intr. P. R.* xxxi)

8. *A Witness to Lenin's Acknowledgement of the Confirmation of Trotsky's Theory*

Although Lenin dropped his utopian position of "democratic dictatorship" and applied what was actually Trotsky's Permanent Revolution, he never left a statement to this effect in print, a fact which later played into Stalin's hands. However, testimony exists that in private Lenin did make this acknowledgement. In November 1927, a few weeks before Trotsky was expelled from the Party, Adolf Joffe, a prominent supporter and personal friend of Trotsky's, committed suicide. Someone in his household immediately telephoned Trotsky, saying that on Joffe's table there was a letter addressed to him. When Trotsky and some friends arrived, they found Joffe's apartment occupied by the G.P.U.

The Stalin clique did not dare to destroy the letter, or even to delete or doctor it. It was published by the Stalinists in *Bolshevik* No. 23-24 of December 31, 1927. Here is Joffe's testimony: "I have often told you that with my own ears I heard Lenin admit that also in 1905 it was *not he,* but you, who were right. In the face of death one does not lie, and I once more repeat this to you now."

Trotsky never doubted Joffe's words. Some years after Joffe's suicide, Trotsky wrote: "A. A. Joffe's words, that Lenin had confirmed my prognosis as correct, must appear incomprehensible to a man who has been raised upon the theoretical margarine of the post-Leninist epoch. On the other hand, whoever reflects upon the evolution of Lenin's ideas in connection with the development of the revolution itself, will understand that Lenin, in 1919, had to deliver a new judgement on the theory of permanent revolution, different from the ones he pronounced . . . before the October revolution, on the basis of isolated quotations without even once examining my position as a whole." *(P. R.* 12-13)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XVI.

TROTSKY SELLS HIS PERMANENT REVOLUTION

1. *Zinoviev and Kamenev Face a Difficulty*

When the march of events brought Stalin's three discarded partners together, Zinoviev and Kamenev were confronted with a hostile attitude among their own followers. Only yesterday the two leaders had laid great stress on the need of combatting the essence of "Trotskyism," the theory of Permanent Revolution. The vexatious situation in which Zinoviev found himself by forming a union with the 1923 Opposition was later aptly described by Trotsky: "Zinoviev's position at that time was truly tragic. Only yesterday a recognized leader of anti-Trotskyism, he on the next day bowed to the banner of the 1923 Opposition. At the sessions of the C. C. all the speakers took every occasion to fling in his face his own declarations of yesterday to which he could say nothing in reply. The same thing was done day in and day out by *Pravda*. On the other hand, the advanced Petrograd workers, followers of Zinoviev, who had engaged honestly and seriously in the struggle against 'Trotskyism' could by no means reconcile themselves to the sudden turn of 180 degrees. Zinoviev was confronted with the danger of losing the best elements of his own faction." (*New Int.*, Feb. 1938, 57)

Zinoviev sought a face-saver to reassure his discouraged and bewildered followers and to take the sting out of Stalin's sharp barbs. He required a formula couched in clear, precise terms making it unmistakable that he did not embrace Trotsky's Permanent Revolution but that he firmly adhered "as always" to Lenin's position of "democratic dictatorship."

Zinoviev's personal declaration to that effect would have had no weight. But if Trotsky made a statement that his theory of Permanent Revolution was false and Lenin's "democratic dictatorship" correct, then such an acknowledgement would naturally satisfy Zinoviev's followers. It would give Zinoviev a "Leninist" justification for having conducted an ideological campaign against Trotsky's Permanent Revolution. Trotsky had no illusion as to precisely what Zinoviev had in mind: "With my acknowledgement of Lenin's correctness, Zinoviev sought, if only partially, to throw a veil over the previous criminal 'ideological' work of his own faction against me." (*Ib.*). In plain language, Zinoviev required of Trotsky a *public* renunciation of the Permanent Revolution as an opportunist concoction. Zinoviev made a base proposal that Trotsky prostitute himself and sell his Permanent Revolution.

2. *Trotsky Offers Himself*

The dirty deal was made in intimate privacy. Trotsky turned another somersault and wrote a document, "Answer to the Questions

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Comrades Concerning the Opposition." At the Fifteenth Conference of the Russian Communist Party, in October 1926, Kamenev, speaking of the political nature of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc, declared: "One of the political documents of this political Bloc contains the words of Comrade Trotsky (from his 'Answer to the Questions of Comrades Concerning the Opposition' of 8-11 of October 1926): 'We proceed from the fact, as experience indisputably established, that in all questions even remotely principled, where anyone of us differed with Lenin, the correctness, without question, was on Lenin's side.' " *(Pravda,* Nov. 5, 1926). This was quite a statement, but it was only an introduction. Trotsky's words, cited by Kamenev, did not specifically mention what at this discussion was uppermost in everyone's mind, the question of Permanent Revolution.

Early in December 1926 the Stalin gang held the Seventh Plenum of the Executive of the Comintern. Here the leaders of the Opposition Bloc went a step further in shamelessly exhibiting Trotsky's political corruptness. As we have shown, Trotsky made the first public step in prostituting his Permanent Revolution through the offices of Kamenev. At the Seventh Plenum Trotsky himself made the "confession" required of him by Zinoviev:

"The differences in that epoch when I stood outside the Bolshevik Party were quite profound. Considering only the basic features, these differences were concerned with the concrete evaluation of the class relations within Russian society and in connection with this the perspectives of the approaching revolution and the possibility of its passing from the democratic to the Socialist phase. With this is bound up the question of the so-called *Permanent Revolution.* On the other hand, the differences touched upon the methods and ways of the Party and its attitude towards Menshevism. In *both* these questions—and this I announce in writing—by far not all the comrades who are present here were correct as against me. ***But Lenin, his doctrine and his Party were unquestionably correct against me.*** *(Pravda,* Dec. 14, 1926, Our emph.—G. S.)

3. *Reinforcing the Sale*

Finally, on the 15 of December 1926 Trotsky submitted an Announcement to the Communist International, explicitly repudiating his Permanent Revolution. Later Trotsky published the central point of the "announcement" in his *Platform* printed in English under the title *The Real Situation in Russia:* "It is not true that we are defending Trotskyism. Trotsky has stated to the International that in all those questions of principle upon which he disputed with Lenin, Lenin was right—and particularly upon the question of *Permanent Revolution and the Peasantry.*" (180, Our emph.—G. S.). Naturally, by "admitting" that Lenin had been correct on the prognosis of the Russian revolution and on the question of the peasantry, Trotsky implicitly

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

justified Lenin's fight against the Permanent Revolution. Moreover, if the announcement was a whitewash for Zinoviev's criminal work of digging up Lenin's attacks against the Permanent Revolution, it automatically served as a whitewash also for Stalin who had done this work together with Zinoviev.

Lest it be imagined that Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev denounced the theory of Permanent Revolution under duress of Stalin's G.P.U., it will be revealing to learn that Stalin, instead of seizing upon the Opposition's Announcement, actually *suppressed* its publication. The explanation for this is simple. The popularization of this announcement in the Comintern press would have taken the fangs out of Stalin's "theoretical" attack upon Zinoviev and Kamenev.

Trotsky actually *complained* of Stalin's withholding the knowledge of his prostitution of the theory of Permanent Revolution from the Communist International. Immediately after quoting the words from the Announcement "Lenin was right—and particularly upon the question of Permanent Revolution and the peasantry," Trotsky wrote: "That announcement, made to the whole Communist International, the Stalin group refuses to print." (180-181). To descend lower in a political and intellectual sense is hardly possible.

Trotsky adhered to the Opposition's profession of political faith as embodied in the Announcement of December 15, 1926 only until after the dissolution of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc near the end of 1927. Barely six months had elapsed after the termination of his partnership with Zinoviev and Kamenev, when Trotsky, in July 1928, pretending that nothing had happened, "criticised" Stalin's Comintern for its attack upon the Permanent Revolution: "The ideological life of the Comintern since Lenin's departure from its leadership, that is, since 1923, has consisted primarly of a struggle against the so-called 'Trotskyism' and partciularly against the 'permanent revolution.'" *(Problems of Chinese Rev.* 135)

Stalin's own hypocrisy on the question of Trotsky's Permanent Revolution is easy to determine by putting several facts together. "When in July, 1917, Lenin had to hide himself from the police, Stalin became the actual head of the Central Organ of the party." (Biographical Notes, Lenin's *Col. Works,* XXI, 291). On September 7, 1917 the Bolshevik Central Organ *(Pravda-Rabochy* No. 1) printed, under Stalin's editorship, Trotsky's attack against Menshevism and war: "Permanent Revolution against permanent slaughter—such is the struggle, and the stake is the destiny of Mankind." But in December 1924 Stalin came out with this theoretical falsification: "There can be no doubt that Comrade Trotsky's theory of 'permanent revolution' is a variety of Menshevism." *(Leninism,* 197)

One aspect of Trotsky's sale of his Permanent Revolution is particularly noteworthy. When on December 15, 1926 he made the Announcement to the Comintern he thereby threw off the pretense of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

criticising Stalin's pretense of building Socialism in one country. This is fully revealed years hence by his own counterposing of the two formulas: "The theory of the permanent revolution, in contradiction to the theory of socialism in one country, was recognized by the entire Bolshevik party during the period from 1917 to 1923." (Trotsky, *Militant*, April 15, 1933)

4. *Belated Echoes of the Sale of Permanent Revolution*

The *Platform* of the Opposition was published abroad. Some thinking people who knew of the early conflict between Lenin and Trotsky on the prognosis of the Russian revolution and of the fact that Lenin in 1917 had adopted Trotsky's position were puzzled when they came upon the amazing statement: "Lenin was right—and particularly upon the question of the Permanent Revolution and the peasantry." One of these people was Albert Treint, an expelled leader of the Stalinist Party of France. When Trotsky was in his Turkish exile, Treint wrote to him and even visited Trotsky personally to obtain an explanation. Obviously it was impossible for Trotsky simply to deny that there had been a deal between Zinoviev and himself. He therefore pretended that the surrendering of his theory of Permanent Revolution had been an "error." He even attempted to shift the responsibility for his act upon his Russian followers who, naturally, could not be reached for verification. It was they, Trotsky charged, who had insisted that he offer himself to Zinoviev: "Zinoviev was confronted with the danger of losing the best elements of his own faction. In these conditions, a number of comrades from the 1923 Opposition insistently argued with me: 'Let us give Zinoviev some general formula that would enable him, if only partially, to defend himself against the blows of the Stalinists on the one hand, and against the pressure from his own Petrograd co-thinkers on the other." (Letter to Albert Treint, *New Int.*, Feb. 1938, 57)

If Trotsky in this instance speaks the truth, then one can form a good idea of the political character of his comrades who could call upon their leader to prostitute himself to maintain unity with Zinoviev.

Anyone who has read Trotsky's writings knows that one of the heaviest weapons he levels against Stalin is the charge that Stalin falsifies the past. Yet, as indicated in the letter to Treint, it was perfectly all right with Trotsky to distort the vital historical past as long as the distortion served his own immediate factional interests: "But I did not break on this question either with the leading center of my own group or with the Zinovievists. However, I did warn my friends that I would not raise the question so long as only the *historical past was concerned.*" (*Ib.* Our emph.—G. S.)

Trotsky insisted that his act did not violate principles. In the same breath he admitted that the deal with Zinoviev rested *completely*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and *exclusively* on factionalism. Trotsky's assertion that no principle was involved in his repudiation of the Permanent Revolution is in itself a confession. Only several months before his death he made the following slip: "In certain important questions, it is true, the 1923 Opposition made *principled* concessions to the Opposition in 1926—" *(New Int.,* March, 1940, 61)

5. *Trotsky's Gain in the Bargain*

Zinoviev gave something in exchange for the face-saver furnished him by Trotsky. In Trotsky's pamphlet *The Suppressed Testament of Lenin* one receives the impression that in 1926 Zinoviev and Kamenev upon mature reflection came to the realization that the 1923 Opposition had proved correct and they had published an "admission" of their "error." From the story as presented by Trotsky one would never imagine that the "admission" signed by Zinoviev and Kamenev was part of the factional deal with Trotsky as a payment for the Permanent Revolution.

In 1928 Trotsky said it was history that "corrected" Zinoviev *(Third Int. After Lenin,* 105). But in 1940 Trotsky quite inadvertently revealed that Zinoviev and Kamenev wrote the "admission" not voluntarily, not because they had honestly concluded that the Opposition of 1923 was correct but because Trotsky and his group *demanded* such an "admission!" "The Zinoviev-Kamenev opposition *on our demand* acknowledged in a special document that the 1923 opposition was correct on all fundamental questions." *(New Int.,* March 1940. Our emph.—G. S.)

CHAPTER XVII.

THE STALIN-TROTSKY BETRAYAL OF THE CHINESE REVOLUTION

1. *The Kuomintang and the Toiling Masses*

In the early Twenties China was divided among various local military governors, each gravitating to some imperialist power. South China basing itself upon the city of Canton was dominated by the Liberal bourgeoisie through its party the Kuomintang.

The Kuomintang aspired, prior to the release of terrific revolutionary forces in 1925-1927, to unify China and to maintain the oppression and exploitation of the Chinese masses chiefly in the interests of the Chinese bourgeoisie, not of the foreign capitalists. However, although in the early stages of Capitalism it was possible for a colonial bourgeoisie to achieve national independence, as in the case of the American bourgeoisie, under capitalist imperialism the fate of all

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

backward capitalist countries became sealed. In order to survive as an exploiting class, the colonial bourgeoisie now had to subordinate itself to imperialism and to accept only a share in the exploitation of its native masses.

The imperialist penetration of China advanced capitalist production, giving rise to a considerable working class. Hand in hand with this development sprang up a struggle of the workers against the exploitation and oppression by the Chinese capitalists and foreign imperialists. Already in the Twenties the working class of China became a major revolutionary force.

The enormous Chinese peasantry, suffering under the yoke of semi-feudal enslavement, living in frightful misery and dying by the millions from chronic starvation and periodic plagues, also represented a potential cauldron of revolution.

2. *The Stalin-Bourgeois Deal in China*

Since 1917 the revolutionary-inspired Chinese workers and intellectuals had their eyes fixed on Russia. With the formation of the Third International in 1919 they looked to Moscow for genuine political guidance. In July 1921 in Shanghai they held the first Congress of the Communist Party of China. Their avowed aim was to organize the workers for the seizure of power.

The rise of the revolutionary spirit among the Chinese workers and intellectuals coincided with the first stages of the Trio's control of the Bolshevik State. In that period it was out of the question for Stalin to entertain the notion that he could bring China under his personal sway. The Comintern was not yet a highly centralized machine following the dictates from the Trio without a murmur of disagreement. Dissentions were rife and many leaders and rank-and-filers were frequently in a mood to reject the guidance of the Russian leadership. Each section of the Comintern had to go through a long process of burocratic centralism around the Moscow burocrats, and so had the component parts of the Bolshevik State. Even decades later, when Stalin with a powerful backing of his military might did get control of China through his Chinese puppets, he lost control of Yugoslavia because of relaxed vigilance over his Yugoslav puppet, Tito. However, in the Twenties Stalin and other burocrats in Moscow feared not "Titoism" but rather the possibility that the stirring masses of China might overthrow their exploiters and start a conflagration throughout Asia with revolutionary repercussions in the rest of the world. Therefore in July 1922 the Second Congress of the Communist Party of China, under the influence of Zinoviev, veered sharply to the Right and adopted a program of fighting for a united, independent bourgeois-democratic republic. Accordingly, the Communist Party of China was instructed to drop its antagonism to the Kuomintang and to pave the way for an ultra-Right move of organizational unity with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the bourgeoisie: "The great importance of the second congress (Communist Party of China), which met in 1922, consisted in the realization of the enormous importance of the anti-imperialist struggle, the struggle for national emancipation, for the bourgeois democratic revolution in a semi-colonial country. This involved a *reconsideration* of the Party's attitude to the national revolutionary organizations, already existing and struggling in China, and first and foremost to the Kuomintang. By its decisions on the formation of a single national front of all forces waging a revolutionary struggle with imperialism and militarism, the C.P. had pre-determined its later entry into the Kuomintang." *(Comm. Int.* VI, Nos. 9-10, 1929, 426. Our emph.—G. S.)

While the Trio's Comintern was slipping the Rightist noose on the neck of the Chinese masses, as this bare summary indicates, the Trio's diplomatic corps set out to groom the Chinese bourgeoisie for the role of hangman of the approaching revolution.

Poorly organized, economically an appendage to foreign capitalism, unable to cope with the insurrectionary atmosphere which was penetrating into the remotest areas of the country, the Chinese bourgeoisie was too impotent to crush the masses. The Trio, therefore, faced the task of building up the strength of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Accordingly, an emmissary, Adolf Joffe, was sent to China to secure an understanding with the bourgeois leaders. This was during the coup Stalin carried out in Georgia and the time when Lenin penned his letter on the national question (Dec. 1922). The Trio's diplomat met Dr. Sun Yat-Sen, the leader of the Chinese Liberals, in January 1923 in Shanghai. As a result of their talks, which were enveloped in secrecy, Dr. Sun Yat Sen and Joffe issued a joint communique on January 26, 1923 in which they expressed their opposition to the Sovietization of China. We quote the most important part of the Joffe-Sun Yat-Sen communique as it appears in the *China Year Book* for 1924:

"During his stay in Shanghai, Mr. Joffe has had several conversations with Dr. Sun Yat-Sen, which have revealed the identity of their views on matters relating to Chinese-Russian relations, more especially on the following points: (1). Dr. Sun Yat-Sen holds that the Communistic order or even the Soviet system cannot actually be introduced into China, because there do not exist here the conditions for the successful establishment of either Communism or Sovietism. This view is entirely shared by Mr. Joffe, who is further of the opinion that China's paramount and most pressing problem is to achieve national unification and attain full national independence, and regarding this great task, he has assured Dr. Sun Yat-Sen that China has the warmest sympathy of the Russian people and can count on the support of Russia." (863)

While the communique was known to the diplomatic staffs of the imperialists, Stalin and his colleagues withheld the publication of this document in the Soviet Union and the Comintern press.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3. *Trotsky's Hand Behind Joffe*

Up to the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations (March 1918) the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs was headed by Trotsky. However, after he officially relinquished the post he continued supervising foreign policy under Lenin's direction, and from the period of Lenin's illness in 1922 he did so under the direction of the Trio. What happened when the Trio broke with him in 1923 after the Twelfth Congress is related by Trotsky: "In 1923 the 'Troika' (Zinoviev-Kamenev-Stalin) made an attempt to remove me from all supervision of foreign policy. This function was formally assigned to Zinoviev. Nevertheless the old relationships and, so to speak, the old unofficial heirarchy continued to remain in force." *(Fourth Int.* June 1941, 133)

To extract the full meaning from Trotsky's testimony, it is necessary to bring certain dates and events into sharp focus. The Joffe-Sun Yat-Sen Communique was issued on January 26, 1923. It is obvious, therefore, that since the Trio opened its drive against Trotsky only after the Twelfth Congress, the Joffe mission was carried out under Trotsky's supervision. And after the Twelfth Congress the Trio did not go beyond the *formal* replacement of Trotsky, leaving to him the practical end of foreign policy.

In all his voluminous writings Trotsky carefully avoided mentioning Joffe's little known (counter-revolutionary pledge) to the Chinese bourgeoisie. In one of his last articles Trotsky commended Joffe precisely in the field where the latter manifested his loyal work for the Stalin burocracy with the following remark: "Our wisest, most careful and mildest diplomat, Joffe . . ." (*F. I.*, June 1941)

Incidentally, Stalin too stressed Joffe's diplomatic side. At Joffe's funeral after Trotsky and many others had been expelled from the Party, among the various wreaths the most conspicuous was the one sent by Stalin's Central Committee: "The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolshevik)—to the veteran of Red diplomacy A. A. Joffe." *(Pravda,* Nov. 20, 1927)

4. *Building Up the Kuomintang*

In September 1923 another Stalinist agent, Borodin, was sent to China. He was destined to superintend the organized disruption of the proletarian revolution in that country. His task was to rebuild the Kuomintang, eliminate its inefficiency and lack of discipline and invest it with a coat of "revolutionary" varnish to make it an attractive trap for the masses.

The Chinese bourgeois leaders headed by Sun Yat-Sen, having been convinced that no threat to their class was intended, agreed to Borodin's supervision of the reorganization of the Kuomintang. Moreover, they left to him the drafting of the new program. "With Sun's support, Borodin drafted a programme based upon cooperation be-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tween the Kuomintang and the Soviet Union and the Communist Party . . ." (Isaacs, *Tragedy of the Chinese Rev.* 67)

The first congress of the Kuomintang under Stalinist influence and direction convened on January 24, 1924. The leaders of the Kuomintang followed their Russian instructor as an orchestra its leader, for it was clear to them that the Soviet authorities stood head and shoulders above the Chinese bourgeoisie in political and organizational experience. "Before long Borodin became the 'instructor and reorganizer' of the Kuomintang. In effect, this meant that he had been placed in supreme command." (Louis Fischer, *The Soviets in World Affairs,* 636)

Besides "revolutionizing" the Kuomintang politically, Borodin was charged with the problem of raising it to its feet militarily. Otherwise neither the unification of China under the Kuomintang nor the stemming the rising proletarian and peasant tide could be attempted. Louis Fischer, using the Stalinist language, termed this phase of Borodin's reactionary work a service to the revolution: "One of Borodin's great services to the cause of the Chinese revolution was the organization, early in 1924, of the military training academy of Whampoa in the Canton harbor. It became the cadre of the army which later conquered half of China. Russian officers assisted in the task, and the Soviet Government advanced 3,000,000 roubles for its organization and early running expenses."

During this period one of the leading military officers of the Kuomintang and several aides were sent to Moscow by Sun Yat-Sen. This officer was Chiang Kai-shek. For six months he was a guest of the Stalinists, then he returned to become head of the Stalinist-financed Whampoa military academy.

Meantime the Chinese Communist Party turned a few degrees further to the Right and at its Third Congress in June 1923 issued a manifesto declaring that "the Kuomintang should be the central force of the national revolution and should stand in the leading position." Most important, the Third Congress acquiesced with the special decision of the burocrats in Moscow that the Chinese Communists join the Kuomintang. The pretext was not difficult to find. The Trio and its supporters spread the deceitful tale that they would *revolutionize* the bourgeois party, the Kuomintang! "The Chinese Communist Party collaborated with the Kuomintang Party with the object of revolutionizing it and converting it (as far as this is possible) into a workers' and peasants' party." *(Com. Int.,* No. 1, 1924, 127)

5. *Trotsky's Line on "Revolutionizing" the Kuomintang*

What was Trotsky's attitude towards "revolutionizing" the Kuomintang, not after the betrayal of the Revolution (1925-1927) but at the time this swindle was perpetrated? On April 21, 1924 the Communist University of the East in Russia, an auxiliary instrument for

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

disseminating Stalinist deception, celebrated its third anniversary. The principal speaker of the evening was Trotsky. In his address he touched upon the Comintern policy in China: "We approve of Communist support to the Kuomintang party in China, which we are endeavoring to revolutionize." *(Pravda,* May 1, 1924). Trotsky consciously deceived the students and all the revolutionary workers who read his spech. He was quite aware that Borodin's work consisted in making the Kuomintang a strong, disciplined bourgeois organization capable of effectively decapitating the vanguard of the workers and peasants of China. Some years later, in 1937, pretending that he had opposed the 1924 Stalin line in China Trotsky wrote with assumed indignation: "The Communist Party of China, as in 1924-25, is making violent efforts to turn over the Chinese working-class movement politically to Chiang-Kai-shek and the Kuomintang. It is a crime all the more horrible because it is being committed for the second time." *(Socialist Appeal,* Oct. 16, 1937)

When Trotsky in 1924 stated "We are endeavoring to revolutionize" the Kuomintang he made an inadvertent admission that the Kuomintang was opportunist. About three years later, in 1927, in the privacy of the upper burocratic circle, Trotsky pointed out that: "The attitude of the Kuomintang towards imperialism was *from the very outset* not revolutionary but entirely opportunist. It endeavored to smash and isolate the agents of certain imperialist powers so as to make a deal with the self-same or other imperialist powers on terms more favorable to the Chinese bourgeoisie. That is all." *(Third Int. After Lenin,* 174. Our emph.—G. S.)

6. *The Opening Events of the Revolution*

China's great upheaval commenced on May 30, 1925. The brutal murder of a Chinese worker by an overseer in a Japanese mill set off a series of social explosions. Mammoth demonstrations of workers and students swept Shanghai. The European police opened fire upon the demonstrators in Shanghai's International Settlement. The proletariat of Shanghai went on a general strike. A boycott of Japanese and British goods was instituted throughout the most important centers of the country. Then occurred the "Massacre of Shameen" in which armed forces of the British and French imperialists mowed down marching Cantonese workers with bullets. The great strike of Hongkong at once followed. The torch of mass resistance to oppression was lighted over Asia.

7. *The "Moscow Spirit"*

The Stalinist burocrats pretended they were deeply moved by the massacre; they immediately sought to create the feeling that aid and revolutionary guidance would be forthcoming from Moscow. Here are a few sentences from an article "The Moscow Spirit" written

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as an "indignant" response to the massacre in China and published first in the Soviet Union then in the Comintern press:

"From now onwards every Chinese will know that the 'Moscow Spirit' is the spirit of revolutionary solidarity which unites the oppressed in the fight against the oppressors; and that on the other hand, the atmosphere which pervades the cellars of the English prisons of Shanghai incorporates the spirit of 'British' freedom.

"MacDonald is right in that there would be no Bolshevism either in the East or in the West, if the forces of capital did not exist. As long however as the force and the yoke of capital does exist, the 'Moscow spirit' will make its way throughout the world.

"The blood which has been shed in the streets of Shanghai will infect the masses with the 'Moscow spirit.' This spirit penetrates everywhere and is invincible. It will overcome the whole world by liberating it."

This article was a potent Stalinist drug for the Communist workers of all countries. It was published in the *International Press Correspondence* of June 18, 1925. The author of the article was Leon Trotsky.

8. *Chiang's Coup in Canton*

To harness the anti-imperialist movement of the masses and turn it into a means for consolidating the power of the Kuomintang, the Comintern burocrats organized a Kuomintang offensive against the Northern war lords who were universally known to serve the imperialists. This scheme was named the Northern Expedition. Paradoxically, the Northern expedition would release tens of million of workers and peasants not only against the Northern war lords and foreign bourgeoisie but, inevitably, against the Chinese landlords and capitalists in the Kuomintang-dominated territory. Therefore, while organizing the Northern Expedition, the Comintern burocrats took steps to strengthen the arm of the native bourgeoisie.

On March 20, 1926 General Chiang Kai-shek suddenly struck a blow against the workers of Canton. His troops surrounded the headquarters of the Hongkong strike committee and arrested the leaders of the strike. Since the most advanced proletarians were concentrated in the Communist Party, he imprisoned many of its members, arrested the political commissars in his army, most of whom were Communist workers and students, and even subjected some Russian advisers to house "arrest." In addition, he detained some Left members of the Kuomintang who had vociferously advocated collaboration with the Communist Party. The Canton bourgeois government set upon the road leading to a military dictatorship.

While things were happening in Canton, Borodin was in Peking seeking to win the "independent" military bandit, Feng, to the side of Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang Kai-shek sent his secretary to Borodin

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

asking the real brain of the Kuomintang to return to Canton without delay. "Strangely" enough, Borodin did not consider that his friendly cooperation with Chiang Kai-shek had been terminated by Chiang's coup. He immediately left for Canton by sea. "The entire Kuomintang navy—such as it was—greeted him as his vessel approached Hongkong. Chiang Kai-shek who took part in this welcome, overflowed with apologies and explanations." (Fischer, 652). The "apologies" were a secret understanding about Chiang's coup.

The coup aroused great alarm among the workers of Canton and threatened to alienate them from the Kuomintang. Seeing this peril to the Stalinist plans, Borodin immediately ordered Chiang to attack the Rightmost Kuomintangists and thus appear to be fighting against both extremes. "Before the final decision to march north was taken, however, Borodin wished to repair some of the damage done by the coup of March 20. Chiang Kai-shek, therefore, engineered a second coup on April 25, this time against the Right." *(Ib.)*. The most conclusive proof that the burocrats in Moscow consciously managed the maneuvers is the fact that the Canton coup of March 20, 1926 was *concealed* by them from the masses. They even *flatly denied it!* The bourgeois press came very close to reporting the truth; but the supposedly revolutionary press lied to the workers. Here is a part of a dispatch printed in an American capitalist newspaper: "Official telegrams state that General Chiang Kai-shek, assisted by Dr. C. C. Wu and other prominent Chinese, has effected a coup d'etat in Canton. A number of Chinese and Russian Communists have been imprisoned. Several Russians are reported to have been killed." *(N. Y. Herald Tribune,* March 26, 1926)

And here is one of the numerous denials by the Stalinist press: "The rumors disseminated by the press to the effect that a conflict has occurred between the Kuomintang and the Communists is utterly groundless." *(Pravda,* April 4, 1926). The *Inprecor* carried refutations of the "Lying report" (April 8, 1926, 415). It declared the news of the March 20, 1926 coup "an invention of the imperialists." (May 6, 1926, 600). Shortly after the coup, Chiang and his close associates applied for membership in the Comintern. They were accepted.

9. *The Northern Expedition*

The crucial phase of the Chinese Revolution commenced with the Northern Expedition in July 1926. The campaign was mapped out by General Blucher and about fifteen other officers, all of the Russian Red Army.

Chiang Kai-shek, the formal commander of the Expedition, was in direct command of 20,000 troops. The Russian Stalinist officers, occupying important posts in Chiang's army, directly commanded 80,000 more troops. Arms for the Expedition were, in the main, supplied by Stalin. The Stalinist propaganda machinery moved alongside

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the military, urging the masses to trust the Kuomintang, to regard Chiang as a "revolutionary general." Says Louis Fischer: "In every military and political aspect, the Northern Expedition showed the dominating influence of Soviet citizens and Soviet ideas." (663)

By the end of 1926 the Northern expedition, having inflicted heavy defeats upon the various military tupans, brought the rule of the Kuomintang to the vast industrial section of the Yangtze. The seat of the government was transferred by Borodin and the Kuomintang leaders to the tri-city of Wuhan formed by Hankow, Wuchang, and Hanyang. At this juncture a controversy broke out within the leadership of the Kuomintang. Chiang Kai-shek wanted to set up the government in Nanking directly under his military control; the "Left" Kuomintangists insisted that they run the government whose seat should remain in Hankow.

10. *The Military Victory of the Shanghai Workers*

The family quarrel in the Kuomintang did not, however, lead to a clash betwen the two factions. Chiang Kai-shek marched his army toward Shanghai which was filled with Northern troops. On February 18, 1927 the Shanghai proletariat rose in a spontaneous insurrection against the Northerners, but was crushed by Li Pao-chang, the military governor. Despite this defeat, the Shanghai workers, undaunted, made a still greater attempt a few weeks later. This time the Northerners fled in defeat.

Shanghai was ablaze with revolutionary enthusiasm. A Stalin correspondent described the situation: "The entire southern section resembles the first days of the October Revolution. The armed workers have the appearance of the typical Red Guards on duty. This impression is strengthened particularly in the Tramway Park which in reality is the main headquarters of the insurgents. The workers there are armed not only with rifles but with machine guns and hand grenades, automatic guns, etc." (*Pravda,* March 23, 1927)

Having become the masters of Shanghai, the workers, misguided by the Stalinists, immediately welcomed the army of Chiang Kai-shek. His occupation of Shanghai was greeted with a tremendous wave of celebration sweeping the entire revolutionary vanguard within and around the Comintern. The Communist Party leaders in Shanghai put out slogans such as "Hail Chiang Kai-shek." Throughout the Kuomintang territory millions gathered in mile-long processions, rejoicing over what they believed to be a victory of the masses. Chiang's position in that period was extremely precarious. He was opposed by the Northern trops and ostensibly by the forces of the Left Kuomintang. But the chief danger came to him from the ever-spreading strike movement and peasant uprisings in his territory. In those March and April 1927 days he was in a despairing frame of mind. Fischer testifies: "Chiang Kai-shek had only a small army. He still faced

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Northern militarist opposition. In the territory he held, strikes and workers antagonism prevented stabilization. In fact, his position in March and April was almost wholly untenable. People in his immediate entourage expected his downfall daily. Chiang's own wife supplied Hankow with information, and the generalissimo himself contemplated suicide." (667)

Borodin was with the Left Kuomintangists in Wuhan. The bulk of the Kuomintang army was under their control and their troops were far better equipped and better trained than Chiang's. Most important, these troops were in a militant, revolutionary mood. But the policy of the Russian burocracy called for *strengthening* Chiang Kai-shek.

With the situation at a boiling point, inaction on the part of Wuhan was out of the question. The Left Kuomintang therefore ordered their army to march—not against Chiang, but against the Northern militarist Chang Tso-lin who indirectly threatened Chiang Kai-shek. By this maneuver the Left Kuomintangists, while securing a victory, disposed of a large proportion of their revolutionary-minded workers: "Hankow lost 14,000 men. Its army fought heroically, taking tanks with rifles. In the end, Chang-So-lin suffered defeat and retreated rapidly northward. But Hankow left the flower of its army, most of them communists, on the field of battle. A victorious army was forced to retire to its base around Hankow." (668). Now the Left Kuomintangists possessed a plausible excuse for not "subduing" Chiang Kai-shek. Their army was too exhausted to undertake a new campaign at once. Henceforth they confined their activity to backstage intrigue, particularly with General Feng whom Borodin had finally induced to join the Kuomintang.

11. *Chiang Acts*

By arranging the battle between the two forces which officially threatened Chiang Kai-shek the Russian burocracy freed his hands to deal with the turbulent strike situation in Shanghai and vicinity. Chiang Kai-shek now had under his jurisdiction about 35,000 troops. The Shanghai proletariat, entirely under Stalinist influence, was more than ten times as powerful as Chiang's army. There were about 300,000 armed striking workers in the city. Moreover, the proletariat enjoyed the sympathy of petty traders, semi-proletarians and students.

Despite the overwhelming odds on the side of the Shanghai masses, Chiang had on his side the Russian burocracy—the most important factor which completely negated all these odds. How the disciplined Chinese stooges of Moscow carried out the policy of strangling the workers of Shanghai was reported on December 11, 1927 at the Fifteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party. Concealed from the workers at the time by both the Stalin and the Trotsky factions, the report, rather part of it, was cited by Trotsky in 1930. Say-O, the commander of Chiang's First Division, innocently warned the Central

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Committee of the Communist Party of China that Chiang had ordered him and his revolutionary-minded troops out of Shanghai: "he, Say-O, proposed to the Central Committee of the Communist Party to agree that he should not submit to Chiang Kai-shek's order. He was ready to remain in Shanghai and fight together with the Shanghai workers against the military overthrow that was in preparation. To all this, our responsible leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, Tchen Du-Siu included, declared that they know about the overturn being prepared, but that they do not want a premature conflict with Chiang Kai-shek. The First Division was let out of Shanghai, the city was occupied by the Second Division of Bai-Sung Gee and, two days later, the Shanghai workers were massacred." *(Problems of Chinese Rev.* 276)

On April 11 and 12, 1927 Chiang's picked troops attacked the headquarters of the Workers' Guard and the trade union center. Some victims of Stalinist-Kuomintang treachery recovered from their amazement and attempted to resist, only to fall under Chiang Kai-shek's bullets. A tremendous man-hunt was instituted. Dispersed, bewildered, revolutionary workers were seized and decapitated right in the streets which were soon heaped high with corpses.

CHAPTER XVIII.

TROTSKY'S SHAM FIGHT ON POLICY IN CHINA

1. *The Russian Workers Astir*

THE STALINIST gang could not very well keep silent about the slaughter of the Shanghai Communist workers by Chiang Kai-shek. This was no coup of March 20, 1926 with the mere imprisonment of a few score members and leaders of the Communist Party, the dismissal of political commissars and other officials and the "arrest" of a handful of Russian Stalinists. The news had to be published and an explanation given. The nervous Stalinist burocrats pretended that the open counter-revolution of Chiang Kai-shek had taken them by surprise. *Pravda,* under the editorship of Bukharin, put the blame upon the Right wing of the Kuomintang, maintaining the impression that the Left Kuomintangists were basically different. "Right Kuomintang sold the Revolution" said *Pravda* on April 15, 1927. The imperialists too were blamed. It was they, *Pravda* charged, who had bribed Chiang Kai-shek to "become" counter-revolutionary.

The explanations were not convincing to the advanced Bolshevik workers. They sensed that there was something radically wrong with the policy in China. The Party was in ferment. The ranks of the Opposition Bloc began to swell with elements who but yesterday had earnestly believed that the Stalin leadership merited full confidence. *(Rev. Bet.* 91). The course of events which created a profound stir

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

within the Party caused a tremendous upsurge within the Opposition. No strenuous argument was now required to convince many rank-and-filers of the Party that Stalin's policies were opportunist, that if Stalin were allowed to continue at the helm he would lead not only the Chinese Revolution but the Soviet Union itself to disaster. Now, if ever, the opposition workers believed, there was the urgent need as well as the possibility to place Trotsky and the Opposition Bloc at the head of the Comintern and the Soviet Union.

But Trotsky was not of a mind to start a drive for the removal of Stalin. He doused his followers with cold water and gave them an incredible justification for doing so:

"In April 1927 at the Party meeting in the Hall of Columns, Stalin still defended the policy of coalition with Chiang Kai-shek, calling for confidence in him. Five or six days later, Chiang Kai-shek drowned the Shanghai workers and the Communist Party in blood.

"A wave of excitement swept over the Party. The opposition raised its head . . . Many young comrades thought that the obvious bankruptcy of Stalin's policy must bring the triumph of the opposition nearer. During the first days after the coup by Chiang Kai-shek, I poured many a bucket of *cold water* over the hot heads of my young friends—and over some not so young. *I tried to prove that the opposition could not rise on the defeat of the Chinese Revolution." (My Life,* II, 273. Our emph.—G. S.)

2. *Zinoviev's Double-Talk Theses on China*

"Buckets of cold water," no matter how icy and numerous, could hardly have sufficed to cool the burning desire of the Oppositionists to remove the Stalin gang. Keen resentment against Trotsky's attitude of non-aggression had already appeared in the Opposition Bloc and expressed itself in a split-off of a group headed by Sapronov and Smirnov. Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev realized that the disaffection in their ranks would become acute unless a show of condemnation of the official policy in China were made.

Zinoviev therefore drew up a document called "Theses on the Chinese Revolution" and on April 15, 1927 presented it to the Politburo, ostensibly as a polemic on the official line on China. The Theses contained a trickily worded "demand" for the organizational and political "independence" of the Communist Party of China from the Kuomintang and at the same time agreed to keeping the Party within the Kuomintang! Here is the combination of these two diametrically opposite, mutually exclusive propositions: "Our slogan under the present circumstances is not withdrawal from the Kuo Min Tang, but the immediate announcement and realization of the complete and unconditional political and organizational independence of the Communist Party of China from the Kuo Min Tang, that is, the complete political and organizational autonomy of the Communist Party of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

China." (Appendix to Trotsky's *Problems* etc. 362). Zinoviev's two-faced position was simply a case of the lackey anticipating the master. A few days later, Stalin, to pour oil on the troubled waters in the Russian Communist Party, also introduced a seeming turn for the organizational independence of the Chinese Communist Party: "While fighting in the ranks of the revolutionary Kuomintang, the Communist Party must preserve its independence more than ever before." *(Pravda,* April 21, 1927)

As history soon revealed, the Kremlin gang, utilizing the convenient "split" between Chiang Kai-shek and the Left Kuomintangists, played the last portion of its Rightist line under the pretense that they represented "the revolutionary" Kuomintang. Zinoviev's zestful work, therefore, was a cover for the enactment of this final phase of the Rightist line.

Trotsky's attitude toward Zinoviev's stay-in-get-out position for the Communist Party of China was made clear in his speech at the Eighth Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Comintern in May 1927: "I am defending here the theses of Comrade Zinoviev as a common one." *(Problems* 83). Such was the artful contrivance to which Trotsky and his partners resorted in their infinite capacity for creating the illusion of fighting Stalin while in essence supporting his policies! Trotsky's own argument ran along the same lines as Zinoviev's. For greater self-protection before the Communist workers, Trotsky, like Stalin, spoke of remaining not just in the Kuomintang but in a "revolutionary" Kuomintang. In his speech at the Eighth Plenum Trotsky said: "Then withdrawal from the Kuomintang—cries Bucharin—Why? Do you want to say thereby that the Communist Party cannot exist within the 'revolutionary' Kuo Min Tang as a party? I can accept remaining within the *really revolutionary* Kuo Min Tang only under conditions of complete political and organizational freedom of action of the Communist party with a guaranteed, *common basis* for actions of the Kuo Min Tang together with the Communist Party." (95. Our emph.—G. S.)

Trotsky enumerated a "conditional" basis for going along with Stalin and Bukharin: "The political conditions therefore have been enumerated in the thesis of Zinoviev as well as in my own (No. 39) more precisely in points a, b, c, d, e, f, g, and h. These are the conditions for remaining in the Left Kuo Min Tang. If Comrade Bucharin is for remaining unconditionally—under all circumstances and at any price—then we do not go along." (95-96)

Trotsky could have given points up the letter Z, the fact was, he advocated staying within the Kuomintang and at the same time withdrawal from the Kuomintang. Trotsky of course knew that a prerequisite for a proletarian-revolutionary policy is complete independence of the proletariat. When he was in his Turkish exile, his *Bulleten Oppositsii* "criticized" Stalin's policy in retrospect: "Never

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and under no circumstances can the Party of the proletariat enter into a party of another class or be entangled with it organizationally. An absolutely independent party is the first and decisive condition of Communist policy." (#1-2, 30)

Stalin's immediate lackeys, silent about Stalin's own double talk on China, spoke with contempt and mockery of the Opposition's proposal to remain in the Kuomintang and simultaneously to come out of it. Yaroslavsky said in *Pravda* of July 24, 1927: "At one and the same moment the proposal was made to leave the Kuomintang, and simultaneously the protest was voiced that a demand was ascribed to the Opposition to leave the Kuomintang."

3. *Trotsky Advancing Radek's Line*

Among the Opposition leaders whom Stalin placed in charge of the practical work of strangling the Chinese Revolution was Karl Radek. Radek was given the post of Rector of the Sun Yat-Sen University in Moscow, where cadres of Chinese students were imbued with Stalinist ideology. There is little doubt that the Rector was well acquainted with Borodin's work in the Kuomintang and was familiar with all the Stalinist machinations with Chiang Kai-shek, including the March 20, 1926 coup in Canton, for, as Louis Fisher pointed out, "in Chinese Affairs Radek enjoyed the advantage of tremendous knowledge and special concentration." All these secrets Radek covered up with a clever yarn. He defended the fundamental feature in the Stalinist policy, the subordination of the Communist Party of China to the Kuomintang, even after Chiang Kai-shek had revealed his Kornilovist character. That Radek's line on China had nothing in common with the interests of the masses, we have the testimony of Trotsky himself, written, however, in later years: "Radek (together with Zinoviev) preached the subordination of the Communist Party to the Kuo Min Tang not only before Chiang Kai-shek's coup d'etat but even after." *(Perm. Rev. xlvi).* "Radek defended a mistaken line in the question of China, Anglo-Russian Committee and, up to 1927 doubted whether in general any other economic course was possible except the course of Stalin-Bucharin." *(Bulleten Oppositsii,* July 1929, #1-2). "In fact Radek was *always* a Left Centrist inside the Opposition." *(Ib.* Our emph.—G. S.)

Trotsky shed this light on the reactionary nature of Radek's line only after Radek had turned against him following the expulsion and exile of the Opposition. However, when Radek and he were working hand in hand in the Opposition, Trotsky had vigorously defended Radek's line: "Radek cannot say anything openly in the press about his line, for otherwise the party would learn that Radek's line is being *confirmed* by the whole course of events." *(Problems,* 81. Our emph.—G. S.) It was only after Radek fell prostrate before Stalin, as did Zinoviev, Kamenev and other former Oppositionists, and dutifully de-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

nounced Trotsky, that Trotsky suddenly rummaged in his vast store of facts and disclosed the Stalinist nature of Radek's line which, Trotsky in 1927 said, was being confirmed in China.

4. *From the Ultra-Right to the Ultra-Left*

Despite the efforts of the Stalinist agents and the Left Kuomintangists, the workers and peasants continued storming bourgeois and landlord property. The Left Kuomintang military leadership, composed virtually to a man of reactionary wealthy landlords, convened in the Spring of 1927 in Chengchow. "The generals at the conference registered unanimity on the question: that the workers' and peasants' movement must be stemmed." (Fischer, 669)

The Stalinists and the Left Kuomintang had no recourse other than an extensive blood-bath for the workers. A noteworthy sidelight of the conference was the presence of Stalin's agent, General Galen-Blucher. It will be remembered that this Galen, or Blucher, was one of the most outstanding Russian Stalinist officers who had organized the Chinese bourgeois military forces and mapped out the Northern campaign.

The generals of the Left Kuomintang and their Russian guides created the impression that they had finally decided to strike at Chiang Kai-shek. They marched an army largely composed of Communist workers off towards Chiang's stronghold: "In June, 1927, accordingly, the Russians in Hankow and their Chinese friends decided to march on Nanking with Tang Shen-chi and Chang Fa kwei." (675). The whole maneuver was calculated to remove this army from Wuhan in order to free the hands of the bourgeois forces for the suppression of the Wuhan masses. In the middle of July the leaders of the Left Kuomintang cast aside their "revolutionary" mask as described by a Chinese Stalinist burocrat: "This evolution to the Right continued until the middle of July 1927, when the leaders of the Wuhan Kuomintang declared a rupture with the Communists. From that moment reaction reigned supreme in Wuhan. All the revolutionary mass organizations of the workers, peasants and students were smashed up. Communists were executed wholesale. In this way the leaders of the Wuhan Kuomintang paved the way for unity with the Nanking center of the bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution." (Mif, *Heroic China,* 49)

This monstrous bloody deed, carried out by T. V. Soong, Su Chen, Wong Ching-wei and other Left Kuomintangists, was deliberatly engineered by the Stalinist clique. Significantly enough, Borodin, who had been taking a rest at a Kuling Mountain resort, returned to Hankow, the scene of the carnage conducted by the Left Kuomintang, just as he had returned to Canton after Chaing's coup in 1926. It is plain that at that moment of butchery on the part of the Left Kuomintang, Borodin was in the closest contact with its leaders. It is no

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

triviality that this Stalinist agent during those bloody days lived in the house of T. V. Soong, the Minister of Finance in the White Guardist Left Kuomintang Government! (Fischer, 676)

The Wuhan phase marked the exhaustion of the Stalinist Rightist tactics in the Chinese Revolution of 1925-1927. The Stalinist gang started mapping out a leftward course. Borodin, having completed his task, was to return to Moscow; the Left Kuomintang was to merge with the Right; the dictatorial hand of Chiang Kai-shek was to be strengthened. And again we find a clear proof of Borodin's close relations with the Kuomintang hangmen. When he informed his Left Kuomintangist friends that he was to leave them they obviously grew uneasy lest they be unable to manipulate the situation as skillfully as he had: "Every day Chinese leaders urged him to reverse his decision. On the 25th a meeting took place in Borodin's apartment where Left Kuomintang statesmen attempted for hours to persuade him to stay. On the 27th they accompanied him to the railway station at Hankow and again begged him to remain." *(Ib.)*. But Borodin had his orders and parted from his Chinese bourgeois friends. The Left turn had already been heralded by the Stalinist clique. On July 25, 1927 *Pravda* advanced the slogan of Soviets for China.

Now to return to the army ostensibly marching against Chiang Kai-shek. The Stalinist officers, whom the workers thought to be *real* revolutionary leaders, halted the march toward Nanking and, repelling the attacks of some Kuomintang forces, executed a maneuver to bring the Communist-spirited soldiers direct into the maw of imperialist powers: "They did not turn towards Canton where they might have mobilized some mass support. No military opposition could have prevented them from reaching the goal. Indeed, they defeated all the generals sent from Kuomintang to retard their progress. Yet instead of marching on Canton, they directed their steps to Swatow right into the mouths of the imperialists." (Fisher, 677)

The Stalinist press described the Swatow trap in glowing terms: "In Red Swatow there is confiscation of landlords' estates." *Pravda* shrieked on September 29, 1927. But early in October Japanese troops opened a savage attack upon the army which the Stalinists had tricked into Swatow. Only fragments of this army managed to escape the trap; the Japanese attack was followed by a general massacre of workers in the city.

The culminating point in the betrayal of the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27 was reached in the Canton uprising engineered on an ultra-Leftist putschist pattern by Stalin's German puppet, Heinz Neuman, near the end of 1927. By then the Kremlin, to cover up the previous line, made a sharp break with the Kuomintang. A "Soviet" was manufactured on short order and the best proletarians of Canton were thrown against the well-organized forces of Chiang Kai-shek. The Stalin burocrats labelled the appalling results of their plot "The Canton Commune." In the wake of that bloodletting came the White

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Terror throughout the Kuomintang territory. The remainder of the industrial Communist proletariat was physically wiped out and the Revolution was terminated.

5. *Trotsky's Consciousness of his Part in the Betrayal*

In the Appendix to Trotsky's *Third International After Lenin,* the founder of the American Trotsky movement, James P. Cannon, realizing that the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc stood on the anti-proletarian formula "democratic dictatorship" hastened to shield Trotsky with a footnote: "The incorrect formula of the 'democratic dictatorship' was put in the platform of the Opposition Bloc through the pressure of the Zinovievists in the bloc. In Trotsky's Criticism of the Draft Program this formula is corrected." (354) Wherein does Cannon's attempt to whitewash Trotsky fall short of the aim? First, Cannon is unable to cover up the fact that Trotsky consciously inserted a counter-revolutionary position as a principled concession to Zinoviev in a horse trade on the Permanent Revolution. Second, Cannon withholds the fact that Trotsky eliminated this position in "The Criticism of the Draft Program of the Comintern" in 1928, many months *after* the betrayal of the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27: "The manuscript of the criticism of the Comintern program was written by Trotsky in 1928, during his exile in Alma Ata." (Shachtman, Intr. to *Third Int. After Lenin,* xlix)

Thus, in the first half of the Chinese Revolution Trotsky disseminated the Stalinist opiate "We are revolutionizing the Kuomintang"; in the second half, with the Declaration to the Comintern on December 15, 1926 against his Permanent Revolution, he added the reactionary "incorrect formula" which in 1927 he inserted into the *Platform.*

Once Trotsky's theoretical-programmatic Stalinist line is clearly brought out, scattering to the winds his myth of having allegedly fought for a proletarian-revolutionary line in China, it is but a simple task to establish his premeditated design, in collaboration with Stalin, to perpetrate the crime. The documentary evidence is supplied by Trotsky himself. In a statement in 1929 in his Turkish exile Trotsky indicated that he and his companions of the Opposition had known *in advance* that the policies Stalin and they pursued in China would not lead to the liberation of the masses but rather to the perpetuation of their enslavement:

"The Second Chinese Revolution (1925-1927) showed throughout *what to the Marxists had been clear beforehand:* the real solution of the tasks of the bourgeois revolution in China is possible only through the dictatorship of the proletariat leaning upon alliance of workers and peasants, against the alliance of the native bourgeoisie with the imperialists." *(Bull. Oppositsii,* Oct., 1929; *Militant,* Dec. 28, 1929)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

6. *The Real Director of the Betrayal*

Let us assemble the scattered evidence of Trotsky's policy. In 1922, when according to Trotsky, no differences existed in the Bolshevik Party, *(New Int.,* Oct. 1939), the leaders of the Comintern, Trotsky among them, maneuvered the Chinese Communist workers into joining the Kuomintang. On January 26, 1923 the Soviet diplomat Adolph Joffe, under Trotsky's supervision of foreign policy, gave a written pledge to the Kuomintang not to establish "a Soviet system" in China. In 1924, in his capacity of War Commissar and head of the Red Army, Trotsky carried out the military aspects of the Stalinist policy in China. To this end Red Army instructors and organizers established the Wampoa Military Academy for the purpose of training Chiang Kai-shek's cadres. Many years later Trotsky guardedly wrote: "We sent organizers and commanders to the help of the Chinese revolution." *(Rev. Betr.* 203). Of course, Trotsky "neglected" to mention that "the Chinese revolution" to whom he had sent aid were not the masses who were attacking the bourgeoisie but the bourgeoisie who were butchering the masses. The political cover Trotsky employed for building up the Kuomintang military engine for the suppression of the workers and peasants of China was the widely-circulated Stalinist fraud: "we are revolutionizing the Kuomintang." (Trotsky's speech to the students of the University of the East, May, 1924). The mask for the Kremlin betrayers was provided by Trotsky in the article the "Moscow Spirit."

While among the Russian Opposition workers the delusion was prevalent that Trotsky battled against the Politburo's policy in China, he was secretly placed by Stalin in the vital post of Chairman of the Chinese Commission of the Politburo. In this capacity Trotsky carried out, naturally, not a proletarian-revolutionary but a Stalinist line. When a short time before his expulsion from the Russian Communist Party Trotsky attempted to put the blame for some of the disruptive moves in the Chinese Revolution upon the Stalin circle, the latter dealt a shattering blow to his demagogy. The revelation was made that Trotsky had been at the head of the Chinese Commission, had himself formulated many of the proposals and was fully responsible for the policy he now pretended to condemn. The important disclosure was made by Yaroslavsky who asserted that the Stalin leadership had had implicit confidence in the Trotskyites and kept them in responsible posts:

"On our part, after the Fourteenth Congress there was no lack of confidence in the representatives of the Opposition. A whole number of Trotskyites worked in responsible Soviet and Party posts (I. N. Smirnov, Bieloborodov, Trotsky, Joffe and others). Trotsky was even at the head of the Chinese Commission in the Politburo of the Central Committee which was taking up questions of policy with regard to China. When Trotsky now attempts to deny responsibility for those

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

decisions which were adopted there, then this is simply a dishonest method, because a whole series of decisions from which he now swears off were accepted at his, Trotsky's, recommendation." (*Pravda,* Nov. 27, 1927)

Indeed, many years later Trotsky inadvertently corroborated Yaroslavsky's public statement. While discussing the secret Japanese document known as the Tanaka Memorandum, Trotsky revealed that in 1925 not Stalin but *he* had been directing the whole Far Eastern policy of the Kremlin, both for Japan and China:

"Even in 1925, after I had already left the War Department and was placed in charge of the modest Concessions Committee, I was, as a member of the Political Bureau, appointed head of the Committee on Far Eastern Affairs, Japan and China. Among the members of this Committee were Chicherin, Voroshilov, Krassin, Rudzutak and others. Stalin was at that time still wary of venturing on the slippery ice of international politics. For the most part, he would listen and look on, formulate his opinion, or merely vote after others had expressed themselves. Zinoviev, who was formally in charge of diplomatic affairs, was inclined, as everybody knew, to fall into a panic whenever a difficult situation arose. All this explains amply why the document received from Tokio was transmitted directly to me." (*Fourth Int.,* June 1941, 133)

It becomes abundantly clear who exactly did the planning of bathing the Chinese Revolution in a sea of workers' and peasants' blood. Neither Voroshilov, nor Rudzutak nor other secondary figures could have worked out the step-by-step details to accomplish the intricate task. Even Stalin lacked confidence in those years. More able than Stalin and all the other burocrats, Trotsky took charge of the problem of disrupting the Revolution through secret deals with Sun Yat-sen, Chiang Kai-shek and others. Stalin merely listened and passed upon Trotsky's suggestions. No mystery, then, that when the entire membership of the Russian Communist Party was thrown into ferment as a result of the Trotsky-Stalin policy in China, Trotsky was compelled to pour cold water on the greatly excited Opposition to prevent the removal of the Stalin regime and the consequent discovery of documentary evidence as to who was the actual guide in the crime of the decimation of the Chinese proletariat and peasantry in the 1925-27 Revolution.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XIX.

STALIN EXTIRPATES THE OPPOSITION

1. *The Chief Cry in Trotsky's Platform*

IN RESTRAINING the anti-Stalin Bolshevik workers and thereby saving the Stalin regime from the severe internal crisis which resulted from the Trotsky-Stalin policy in China, Trotsky thereby doomed the entire Opposition. No sooner had the ruling clique weathered the storm of resentment than it opened a furious drive directed toward the elimination of the Opposition from the Party. Pursued by Stalin on the one hand and pressed by their own restless followers on the other, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev compiled a number of their "views" into an extensive document known as *The Platform of the Opposition.* On September 3, 1927 they submitted the *Platform* to the Central Committee for the consideration of the Party and its forthcoming Fifteenth Congress.

The political core of the *Platform* was, as we have already mentioned, the factional Trotsky-Zinoviev deal denouncing the Permanent Revolution and upholding the counter-revolutionary "Democratic dictatorship" formula shared by Stalin and Bukharin. The programmatic organizational line of the *Platform* was unity with the Stalin faction. This line, Trotsky declared, was the most outstanding in the immediate situation: "The chief slogan for the whole preparations of the Fifteenth Congress, ought to be unity." *(Real Sit. in Russia,* 127). Indeed, Trotsky sought to maintain unity with the Stalin gang *at all costs!* "The opposition is for the unity of the party. Stalin propagates his own program—to 'cut off' the opposition—under the false flag of a pretense that the Opposition wants to create a 'second' party. The Opposition answers with its slogan: 'Unity of the Leninist Russian Communist Party *at all costs.*" (125. Our emph.—G. S.)

2. *Strong Oppositional Sentiment*

Stalin prohibited the publication of the *Platform* because to publish it would have meant to legalize a discussion which could only have retarded his final offensive against the Trotsky Opposition in the Party.

Taking a last-ditch stand under the pathetic slogan of "unity at all costs!" Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev agreed to the printing of the *Platform,* of the Testament and other documents illegally. We say *agreed,* because apparently the initiative and impetus came not from them but from "the young comrades, they were impatient. They secured a mimeograph machine. They were discovered." *(The Case,* 325)

Stalin acted swiftly and brutally. On the 27 of September, 1927 he caused the removal of Trotsky and Vuyovich from the Executive Committee of the Comintern. The next day fourteen Oppositionists were expelled from the Party for printing the *Platform* and were seized by the G.P.U. Expulsions and persecutions followed in profusion. Life in the Soviet Union now flowed more turbulently and desperately. Stalin

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

violently attacked everything that even distantly savored of dissent from the official line.

The Opposition in great alarm held secret meetings at which Trotsky, Kamenev and other leaders addressed the eager audiences, talking much, but, naturally, revealing little.

As the situation in the Party surged toward a climax, striking events occurred. Like an echo from the stirring days of 1917, was the mighty, spontaneous anti-Stalin demonstration of the proletariat of Leningrad on October 17, 1927.

Despite the wave of expulsions and unrelenting hounding of the Opposition, in the face of the omnipresent G.P.U., the Leningrad workers and Red Army soldiers openly turned their backs upon Stalin and his coterie. They marched and for four hours, fearlessly, kept on shouting names—Zinoviev! Kamenev!—and above all—*Trotsky!*

One does not have to ponder on the importance of the great demonstration of the Leningrad proletariat. If the tone of the demonstration meant anything at all, if the frigid attitude of the proletariat toward the official leadership and the warm acclaim of the leadership of the Opposition contained any sense and purpose, they were no other than a demand for the removal of Stalin and his crew and the placing of Trotsky in the seat of power. But this obvious content of the demonstration Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev avoided pointing out. A few days later, on October 23, 1927, speaking against the proposal to remove him from the Central Committee, Trotsky declared: "The non-party workers have not believed your lies and slanders against us. Their legitimate dissatisfaction at the growth of burocratism and suppression was expressed by the working class of Leningrad in the unmistakable demonstration of October 17. The proletariat is for the Soviet power, unwaveringly, but it wants a different policy." The speech was translated by Eastman and appended to the *Platform of the Opposition*. Trotsky of course meant not the Lenin policy to remove Stalin but that the Stalin faction should adopt a different policy toward the Opposition. By this seemingly resolute and defiant tone Trotsky sought to have Stalin think well before moving irrevocably against the Opposition.

Zinoviev pleaded with the Stalin gang not to ignore the deep significance of the Leningrad demonstration: "You feel unpleasant when we remind you here of the demonstration of the Leningrad workers on October 17, 1927 . . . But its political significance is enormous . . . That which took place yesterday in Leningrad will occur tomorrow in the rest of the workers' centers . . . The workers of Leningrad not only did not believe the accusations against us, but unitedly and turbulently supported us. Don't be blind and deaf, take into account the Leningrad demonstration of October 17." (October 1927 Plenum of the Central Committee, *Pravda,* Nov. 2, 1927)

Pleading for the establishment of a collective burocratic rule, Zino-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

viev lied: "Lenin in his Testament pointed out the shortcomings of every one of us, but he bade us to work together. We are absolutely convinced that the way out is only along the path which Lenin indicated. We do not at all think that the entire present apparatus is worthless. We do not at all wish that after our victory Stalin should go into a forest, and that Bukharin should set up an 'illegal memiograph.' (Laughter. Voices:—Enough! Down!)" *(Ib.)*

Lenin, of course, did not say anything about working together with Stalin but that Stalin should be removed from the post of General Secretary.

While the Opposition professed to champion greater democracy, Zinoviev intimated that democracy was not a crucial point: "Nobody demands an 'ideal,' perfect democracy. Times are hard—we understand this. Difficulties will yet exist. (Voices: Down! Enough!)" *(Ib.)*

Stalin and his lieutenants doubtless regarded the leaders of the Opposition with a mixed feeling of disgust and amusement. Well did the ruling gang know that Trotsky and his allies were caught in a pincers of their own making. All that Trotsky and the other former partners of Stalin could do with the outspoken anti-Stalin sentiment of the Leningrad workers was to attempt to use it as a card-board club to induce Stalin to adopt a peaceful settlement with the Opposition.

3. *The Opposition Disseminates the Testament*

Among the documents the Opposition printed for distribution was Lenin's Testament. In this connection a very interesting charge was made by Yaroslavsky. He reported that by way of concession to Zinoviev and Kamenev, Trotsky and other leaders of the Opposition mutilated the famous document: "The same kind of attempt to establish a printing press is made in Leningrad, where there is printed the so-called Testament of Lenin, without those parts which say of Kamenev and Zinoviev that their October mistake was not accidental. (Laughter. Voices: This is editorial work of Zinoviev! Another voice: No, of Trotsky! Laughter)." *(Pravda,* Nov. 27, 1927)

This allegation, published in *Pravda* and elsewhere, could not have escaped Trotsky's attention. In the ensuing years Trotsky refuted many anti-Trotsky lies of the Yaroslavskys. But with respect to the charge that he had mutilated Lenin's Testament to suit his allies, Zinoviev and Kamenev, we have not found a single word of refutation in his writings. The cardinal fact stands out, however, that Trotsky's union with the former members of the Troika was conceived in the spirit of mutual shielding, with Trotsky making many "concessions" of the most serious character. Apparently Trotsky, who stooped so low as to conclude a cynical deal with Zinoviev on the Permanent Revolution, did not shrink from eliminating the caustic remark about his partners from the Testament.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Trotsky's Disavowal of the Testament Used Against Him*

At the October 1927 Plenum of the Central Committee the leaders of the Opposition committed a tactical blunder by flinging at the ruling faction the charge of suppressing Lenin's advice to remove Stalin. Trotsky declared: "The party did not know this counsel in time. A selected officialdom concealed his letter." (Cited in *The Real Situation in Russia,* 8). In reply to Trotsky's accusation Stalin admitted that there was a Lenin Testament but he used this admission as a club against Trotsky. Citing Trotsky's statement on Eastman, Stalin flung back into the faces of the Opposition leaders Trotsky's disavowal of Lenin's Testament. He read these words of Trotsky's: " 'All talk about a 'Testament' are malicious inventions which are entirely directed against Lenin's actual wishes and against the interests of the Party created by him.' " (Stalin, quoting Trotsky from *Bolshevik* of September 1925; *Pravda,* Nov. 2, 1927; *Inprecor,* Nov. 17, 1927). And Stalin caustically commented: "This seems to be clear, this is what Comrade Trotsky wrote and no one else. What is the reason which now induces Comrades Trotsky and Kamenev to misrepresent things by maintaining that the Party and the Central Committee are 'hiding' Lenin's 'Testament'? A slip of the tongue is 'possible,' but there must be limits."

Stalin in the same speech proceeded to tell a strange tale which Trotsky never rejected as false: "Even at the first meeting of the Plenary Session of the Central Committee, after the Thirteenth Party Congress, I handed in my resignation of the function of General Secretary, asking the Plenary Session to relieve me of this duty. The Party Congress itself dealt with this question. Every single delegation has dealt with this question and all the delegations, including Trotsky, Kamenev and Zinoviev unanimously resolved that Stalin should remain in this post. What could I do? Run away from the post? It is not in my character to do that. I have never run away from any post, no matter what post it was, and I have no right to do so, because that would be desertion." *(Ib.)*

Stalin of course took care not to explain that in the period to which he referred, Zinoviev and Kamenev had been his partners, that the majority of the delegates had been fixed by the Trio to reject the pretended resignation, and that Trotsky had had no other choice but to continue the policy he had initiated when he had suppressed Lenin's attempt to remove Stalin. Naturally, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev could never make public their reason for having rejected Stalin's "resignation."

5. *Stalin Makes Use of Lenin's Letters Against Zinoviev and Kamenev*

Immediately following the October 1927 Plenum of the Central Committee Stalin released for publication Lenin's letters of 1917

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

against Zinoviev and Kamenev. These documents contained some of the sharpest words Lenin ever used against a Party member. Because Zinoviev and Kamenev had opposed the October insurrection and had come out in the non-Party press attacking the Bolshevik Central Committee and revealed its momentous decision to overthrow the Kerensky regime, Lenin had branded them as strike-breakers, swindlers, liars and betrayers, and demanded their expulsion from the Party. As may be imagined, the printing of these letters *(Pravda,* Nov. 4, 1927) was a fearful blow to the Opposition.

There is no "mystery" about the absence of these letters from the first collection of Lenin's works published in 1921-1922-1923 when it is known that the editor of this collection was Kamenev. It is equally clear why they were kept hidden during the rule of the Trio (1921-1925). When Stalin broke up his partnership with Zinoviev and Kamenev he refrained from publishing them immediately, for had he utilized these letters during the brief tussle with Zinoviev and Kamenev at the Fourteenth Congress, it would have been too obvious an act of crude, personal revenge. It was quite different with the publishing of these letters now, almost two years after the dissolution of his alliance with Zinoviev and Kamenev. The long delay spoke in Stalin's favor, denoting his infinite patience with these decayed opportunists.

The publication of the letters by Stalin in the Autumn of 1927 brought out again the curious contradiction in which Trotsky found himself. It would have been a simple matter to hit Stalin by merely referring the workers to that section of Lenin's Testament which declared that the October act of Zinoviev and Kamenev should not be held against them. Nowhere can we find even the remotest attempt on the part of the heads of the Opposition to defend themselves by citing this position of Lenin. For their failure to avail themselves of this strong means of defense there is to our mind only one reason that suggests itself: the Oposition leaders could not refer the workers to that portion of the Testament because in the version of the Testament which the Opposition printed the statement on Zinoviev and Kamenev was omitted.

6. *The Opposition's "Unity" Demonstration*

On November 7, 1927, with elaborate staging, Stalin unfolded the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution. Huge parades took place in the great centers of the Soviet Union. The Opposition was in agony. Many of its ranks were in the grim dungeons of Stalin's G.P.U. Remembering the impressive spontaneous anti-Stalin showing in Leningrad, a complete surprise to both factions, Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev resorted to a tactic of desperation. Grasping at a straw, they planned to stir up new mass demonstrations, hoping to lessen Stalin's mounting savagery. Groups of Oppositionists

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with placards attempted to enter the parades in Moscow and Leningrad and rally the excited workers around the Opposition. At the Dewey hearing Trotsky recited the slogans on the Opposition placards:

"1. 'Fulfill Lenin's Testament!'
2. 'Turn the Fire on the Right—Against the Nepman, the Kulak and the Burocrat!'
3. 'For Genuine Workers' Democracy!'
4. 'Against Opportunism, Against Splits—For the Unity of the Party of Lenin!'
5. 'For the Central Committee of Lenin!' " *(The Case,* 422)

The only slogan which seemed to aim at the heart of the Stalin clique was the one saying "Fulfill Lenin's Testament"; but *Pravda* five days earlier had published Zinoviev's explanation of what the Opposition had in mind in presenting this slogan: "Lenin in his Testament pointed out the shortcomings of every one of us, but he bade us to work together." The rest of the slogans were almost word for word the expressions found in the every-day hackneyed pronunciamentos of Stalin's journalists and flunkeys.

The hazardous "unity" undertaking brought the very opposite results hoped for by the Opposition. Stalin was alert to forestall a repetition of the Leningrad experience. This time the G.P.U. took charge of the parades, detailing its agents to head every marching column. Cooperating with the G.P.U. were the officials of factories and State functionaries who kept an eye upon the workers. Special gangs of hooligans dealt with the Opposition in the approved Ordjonikidze style of 1922. When the Oppositonists appeared with their unity placards the hoodlum gangs and the G.P.U. went into action. The placards were torn into shreds, those who carried them were brutally beaten and then arrested. Trotsky in his autobiography says that a policeman shot at his automobile and a drunken official smashed the glass in his car.

With the collapse of the desperate move of the Opposition the long-awaited finale was at hand.

7. *Trotsky's Last Desperate Plea for Unity with Stalin*

The final act of the drama was performed at the Fifteenth Congress of the Party opened by Stalin's favorite Rykov on December 2, 1927. It was a solid Stalinist phalanx assembled for the purpose of annihilating the Opposition. Years afterward, in the process of burocratic centralization, Stalin "rewarded" the vast majority of the 1,669 "delegates" of the Fifteenth Congress including Rykov, by having them imprisoned and shot.

On the 3rd of December, 121 leaders of the Opposition, Trotsky among them, addressed a declaration to the Presidium of the Congress. Intended as an expression of atonement for their recent behavior and as a new plea for organizational and political unity with Stalin, the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Declaration of December 3, 1927 openly stated that the Opposition's program was identical with the program of Stalin's Party: "We have no programmatic differences of any kind with the Party." *(Pravda,* Dec. 20, 1927; *Inprecor* #2, 1928, 65)

If Trotsky had no programmatic differences with Stalin, why then the oppositional aspect of the Declaration? Because Trotsky's last hope for maintaining a semblance of protection against the ruling gang was to retain the backing of the proletarian vanguard and particularly of the youth. The oppositional pose, therefore, performed a valuable service for Trotsky in making him appear as the champion of their anti-burocratic interests. With an eye to these elements he declared he would not renounce his "views"; while with an eye to Stalin he obligingly announced he would completely dissolve the Opposition and submit to Stalin's orders: "We cannot renounce views which we are convinced are correct, and which we presented to the Party in our Platform and theses, but for the sake of maintaining the unity of the Party, securing the full fighting capacity of the Party as the leader of the State and of the world proletarian movement, we declare to the Congress that we are discontinuing all factional work, are disbanding all fractional organizations and are calling upon all those sharing our views in the C.P.S.U. and the Comintern to do likewise. Submission to the Congress we hold as an unconditional obligation of a Party member and we shall carry out this submission." *(Ib.)*

Stalin of course understood quite well that Trotsky had no "views" contrary to the fundamental Stalin line. But he required Trotsky's unreserved capitulation to sever him from the vanguard and put him completely under the thumb of the ruling gang. In consequence the maneuvering of the two burocrats revolved around the question of Trotsky's "views." Trotsky adamantly held on to the "views"; while Stalin just as persistently demanded the renunciation of them. Stalin at the Congress laid down his peremptory condition: "We have one condition: the Opposition must disarm entirely and completely both in ideological and in organizational respect." *(S. R.* 82)

The ninth session of the Congress adopted the resolution that adherence to the Opposition was incompatible with membership in the ranks of the Bolshevik party. The entire Opposition was expelled.

Trotsky's partners, Zinoviev and Kamenev, wrote finis to all their wasted hopes and thwarted aspirations and prostrated themselves before Stalin on his terms. Accordingly they were reinstated in the Party. But Trotsky, though on his knees, was inflexible in his determination to win the right to live in this position. He realized that their renouncing the cover "views" and abject crawling would not save them from humiliation and persecution.

By their complete and utter self-abasement, Zinoviev and Kamenev set an infectious example and a number of the Oppositionists, chiefly followers of Zinoviev, meekly accepted the verdict of total

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

failure. They were reinstated by Stalin into what they imagined to be grace and safety—only to vegetate in disgrace until the bloody harvest of the Moscow Trials.

Trotsky naturally saw that his case was totally different from those of all the other Oppositionists. Were he to abandon the cover-issues, the Stalin clique would efface his entire role in the October Revolution and in the Marxist movement in general. Because at one time he had stood high above Stalin in power and prestige and was superior to all the Stalinist burocrats, he would have been reduced to a position below the meanest flunkey in the apparatus and would merely be awaiting the physical end.

But there was a more honorable perspective if he stood adamant in maintaining his "views." Tens of thousands of revolutionary workers in Russia and abroad sensed that Stalin's policies were counter-revolutionary. In 1923 due to the Trio's attack upon him Trotsky had attracted these revolutionary workers. He and his supporters had succeeded in making him appear as the champion of revolutionary policy. With mathematical certainty Trotsky could expect that ever new throngs of advanced workers would be leaving Stalin's Party and the Comintern in search of the authentic revolutionary current. Automatically these elements would move in the direction of the much-abused authentic organizer of the October overthrow. According to *all* existing sources—the bourgeoisie, the Opposition and the Comintern burocrats themselves, Trotsky was fighting Stalin. It would be years, perhaps decades, before a thorough investigation unearthed the secret that though he and Stalin were at swords' points, they represented the same political system. If he were finally to fall under Stalin's blows, the impression that he was a threat to the burocracy would only become more firmly rooted in the mind of the anti-Stalin revolutionary workers. In short, the only possibility of any sort of a political future for Trotsky was the continuation of the sham Opposition.

Trotsky must have arrived at this realization gradually, and once it had crystallized it became the focus of his life. Zinoviev, a much lesser figure, could never have hoped for a position similar to the one Trotsky would occupy in the minds of the revolutionary workers. Having sensed that there was no possibility to regain his lost power, Zinoviev was ready barely a year after the formation of the Bloc to surrender all the cover-issues and to become a grovelling cur at Stalin's feet. But the turbulence stirred up by the Chinese events had revived Zinoviev's hope that Stalin would relent in his drive.

Aptly shielded by Trotsky and other leaders, Stalin took a savage satisfaction from the hopeless position of his victims. Armed with the mighty crusher of the G.P.U., he outlawed the Opposition. Article 58 of the Soviet Code, dealing with the safety of the State, originally understood to be directed against the bourgeiosie, was utilized by

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Stalin against the Opposition. In the ensuing weeks, in the dead of the night, the G.P.U. routed the Oppositionists out of their beds and hustled them off to the grim Lubiankas and Butirkas. Without even a farce of a trial, the captives were transported to Siberia and to the bleak, desolate Arctic region.

CHAPTER XX.

TROTSKY'S PART IN THE MURDER OF RYKOV

1. *Trotsky's Persisting Popularity*

With the expulsion of the Opposition, burocratic centralism increased sharply, yet Stalin was continually dogged by Trotsky's popularity among the workers. This was apparent when Stalin, to clinch his triumph, exiled Trotsky to Alma Ata in Central Asia. The deportation was to take place in the middle of January 1928. On the designated day Trotsky and his family were waiting in their apartment for the agents of the G.P.U. When the hour for departure struck, Trotsky was informed that his trip had been postponed. Presently some of Trotsky's friends arrived and told what had occurred. There had taken place a demonstration at the station, an attempt to prevent his exile.

Trotsky's departure was rearranged. He and his family were told that they had two days' stay after the demonstration at the station. But hardly 24 hours had elapsed when the G.P.U. seized him and his family and carried them to another station. Thence the railroad car was taken outside Moscow to be attached to a train bound for Central Asia. These measures put the Trotsky sympathizers off the track.

Trotsky later wrote that the sympathy for him and the Opposition did not diminish among the workers; on the contrary, it grew during 1928. This is probably true. There were reports of widespread discontent with the Stalin regime; in some factories workers went on strike. The striking workers reportedly presented a demand to the Stalin apparatus to annul the exile of Trotsky. According to the correspondent of the Menshevik paper in Berlin, such demand was voiced by the strikers at the Luberets works: "What is most interesting, among the demands there appeared something new, political: to rescind the order for Trotsky's exile." (Feb. 21, 1928)

The anti-Stalin mood of the workers presented a curious blend of protection and danger to Trotsky. Again, as in every other crisis of Stalin's power, Trotsky was impelled to deflect the resentment of the proletarian vanguard into safe channels. He understood that the only way the danger could be warded off was for Stalin to use the scapegoat method again. The expulsion and decimation of the Trostky opposition made the Stalinist workers feel that the "menace of Trotskyism" had been disposed of once and for all. Temporarily the clamor had to be raised against a new "danger." To this end

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky decided to utilize one of the "views" which he, Zinoviev and Kamenev had fabricated and incorporated in the *Platform of the Opposition.*

2. *A Feat of Political Craftsmanship*

In their concoction Trotsky and his partners in the Opposition Bloc had taken a page from the history of the Second International. During the War of 1914 the Second International collapsed into three currents: the Right which came out in open support of the War; the Center, which was opposed to the War in words but would not break with the openly chauvinist Right, and the Left which stood for a break with both the Right and Center and called for the creation of the Third International. Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev had theoretically divided the Stalinist burocracy into three fundamental currents. The "Left" which they headed they called the proletarian-revolutionary tendency. Stalin, Uglanov and others were represented as heading the vacillating Center, and Rykov as the pro-bourgeois Right.

The branding of Rykov as a Rightist in the *Platform* was merely an enlargement upon an early factional maneuver by Zinoviev against Stalin at the Fourteenth Congress in December 1925. At that time, using the "danger" of the kulaks and Nepmen as cover-issues to avoid attacking Stalin directly, Zinoviev had hit at Stalin's new favorites Rykov and Bukharin. Stalin had parried Zinoviev's thrusts by personally defending his henchmen: "During the Fourteenth Congress, Zinoviev accused Bukharin and Rykov of a right deviation. And Stalin took their defense." (*The Case,* 324)

When one is familiar with the pro-Stalinist policies of Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev, their attempt to separate themselves from the Stalin clique by merely pasting a "centrist" label on it and a "Revolutionary Left" label upon themselves becomes ludicrous. And if one adds to this picture the factional origin of the "Rightist" charge against Rykov, their concoction of dividing the Stalinist system into a pro-bourgeois "right" (Rykov), a wavering "center" (Stalin), and a "proletarian-revolutionary Left" (Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev) dissolves into thin air.

Trotsky knew that since August 1927, starting in China, the Stalin leadership was unfolding the Leftist sigzag. When in 1924 the Trio had resorted to a brief Left zigzag, it turned Brandler and Thalheimer, who had loyally executed the Trio's Rightist instructions, into "Rightist" scapegoats. Could there be any doubt in Trotsky's mind that in the new Leftist turn, with the "Trotsky menace" out of the way, the only possible target at Stalin's disposal remained the "Right danger.?"

It was not difficult for Trotsky to figure out who would be the forthcoming "Rightist" among the eminent Russian leaders. Although in 1925 Stalin had defended Rykov against Zinoviev's attack, in 1927

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

there was a sign that Rykov would soon be in disfavor. Trotsky in October 1927 in a letter to the Buro of Party History noted this foreshadowing of Rykov's fall:

"Permit me to touch in passing upon an episode concerning comrade Rykov. Many comrades were surprised at the publication, in the notes of the Lenin Institute, of an article in which Lenin wrote several unpleasant lines in regard to Rykov. . . . How did these lines happen to see the light of day? Ordinarily, in these times, only those harsh comments that bear upon Oppositionists are quoted from the works of Lenin. About the representatives of the present majority, it is permitted to quote only praise (provided there is any). How then did the above lines get into print? Everybody is explaining this fact in exactly the same way: Stalin's historians consider necessary (so soon! so soon!) a complete objectivity—in regard to Rykov." *(Stalin School,* 20-21)

With remarkable insight into the mechanics of Stalin's intrigues Trotsky in his letter quoted Lenin's speech of January 20, 1920 containing a sharp attack against Rykov, and concluded "The speech of Lenin quoted above will be brought forward when the time comes to decapitate Rykov." (51)

In February 1928, out of nowhere, Bukharin and others conjured up a "right danger" at the Ninth Plenum of the Executive of the Comintern. In the ensuing months the talk about the "Right danger" increased. By putting two and two together, Trotsky knew whom to attack in order to help Stalin overcome the crisis caused by the expulsion of the Opposition. Taking as a working basis the fictitious division which he, Zinoviev and Kamenev had elaborated in the *Platform,* Trotsky with cold cynicism picked out Rykov's name as the central target upon which to concentrate the hatred of the Oppositionists. The selection of Rykov was the more logical since he had figured largely at the Fifteenth Congress which expelled the Trotsky followers and turned them over to the G.P.U.

3. *Trotsky Manufactures a "Victory" of Rykov Over Stalin*

Trotsky had to give his latest ingenious plan a seemingly concrete basis. He seized upon the July 1928 Plenum of Stalin's Central Committee to establish a "fight" of Rykov against Stalin. As can be surmised, all the burocrats at the Plenum vied with one another in fawning upon Stalin. But this did not deter Trotsky from twisting reality to fit his fable. He wrote an article "The July Plenum and the Right Danger" in which he announced that Rykov had scored a victory over Stalin! Trotsky of course realized that such a blatant deception would sound a bit silly to many of his followers, so, in the same breath, he explained that the "victory" Rykov won was secured with *Stalin's* consent! "The July Plenum of the Central Committee marks the first victory of Rykov over Stalin, gained to be sure with the consent of the latter." *(Militant,* Dec. 15, 1928)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The proof that Trotsky's story of a Rykov-Stalin battle and Rykov's victory in July 1928 is a fabrication was given by the Trotskyites themselves some ten years later. The new version, giving the actual facts, plainly stated that Rykov and Stalin were united up to 1929 and that when the break did come it was not Rykov who fought Stalin but the Stalin apparatus that opened a campaign against Rykov and crushed him: "Between 1923 and 1929, Bukharin, Rykov, Stalin and Voroshilov marched arm in arm in a relentless crusade against Trotsky and his supporters. At the end of that period, during which the four and their associates mutually defended each other, Bukharin-Rykov-Tomsky were opened up on by the Stalin machine, which threatened them with expulsion unless they capitulated, which they finally did." *(Soc. App.,* March 5, 1938). In 1928, however, Trotsky built up the fraud of a terrific battle between the supposedly powerful Rykov "Right" and the "weak" Stalin "Center."

"The Right wing," sounded Trotsky's tocsin, "is the handle on which the enemy classes are pulling. The success of this wing will be but a temporarily disguised victory of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat." ("The July Plenum and the Right Danger.") Stalin was subjecting the Oppositionists to a nightmare of exile, imprisonment and GPU brutality. But Trotsky, to divert the hatred of the Opposition workers from Stalin's savage persecution, painted a bloody picture of what the complete victory of Rykov's "Right" would mean to the workers. Stalin's system may have been brutal but "now it is Rykov's turn. One can imagine what persecutions the Right is going to turn loose when relying openly upon the property instinct of the Kulak." *(Militant,* Dec. 15, 1928). And upon the basis of this picture Trotsky presented a "solution" to the Russian workers—a "solution" which was the political essence of his fantastic diatribe. Minimizing the danger of Stalin, he wrote: "At present our *principal task* is to prevent the triumph of the Right." *(Ib.)*

While Rykov, unquestionably, worried over the multiplying signs pointing to Stalin's plot against him, Trotsky, who had realized a year before that Rykov was scheduled for political and organizational decapitation, made it seem that Rykov was in a jubilant mood celebrating a *victory over Stalin!* "At the same time that Rykov was celebrating this triumph, Stalin, the vanquished, made a speech at Leningrad."

Trotsky finished writing "The July Plenum and the Right Danger" on July 23, 1928 and sent it to the Sixth Congress of the Comintern (July-Sept. 1928). He not only facilitated the acceleration of the turn toward ultra-Leftism by striking at the "Right Danger" but even designated the precise scapegoat for the Comintern: "We say to our Party and to the Communist International: Rykov is beginning openly to surrender the Revolution of October to the enemy classes. Stalin is standing now on one foot, now on the other. He is beating a retreat before Rykov and firing to the Left."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

However, Bukharin, acting as the political leader of the Congress, did not release the document to the delegates. Evidenly the Stalin clique was not quite ready to bring up Rykov's name as a "Rightist." Speaking on August 4, 1928, after the arrival of Trotsky's document, Bukharin confined himself to attacking the fictitious "Right danger" without referring to anybody in particular: "Comrades, it is quite clear, that at present, after the defeat of the Trotskyist opposition, which represented a bloc of the Rights with ultra-Lefts, the main danger undoubtedly, is the Right danger . . . The Right danger is a fact."

4. *A Blueprint for the Moscow Trials*

Not many months after Trotsky had sent his article "The July Plenum and the Right Danger" to the Sixth Congress, Rykov and Bukharin were openly stigmatized by Stalin as "Right deviationists" and were made to eat dirt "confessing" their "errors."

Ten years later the alleged "Rights" and the former Trotskyites were framed together by Stalin's G.P.U. as agents of the imperialists in the shocking performances called the Moscow Trials. In the "indictments" Rykov and others were "accused of having on the instructions of the intelligence services of foreign states hostile to the Soviet Union formed a conspiratorial group named the 'bloc of Rights and Trotskyites' with the object of espionage on behalf of foreign states, wrecking, diversionist and terrorist activities, undermining the military power of the U.S.S.R." *(The Case of Anti-Soviet "Bloc of Rights and Trotskyites,"* 5)

Prosecutor Vishinsky asked Rykov at the Trials:

" 'Accused Rykov, tell us, when did your underground, conspiratorial activities against the Soviet government begin?'

"Rykov: 'Essentially, they began in 1928' " (158)

Although these words were put into Rykov's mouth by Stalin's G.P.U. in 1938, back in 1928, Stalin himself, speaking on the subject of "The Right Danger in the C.P.S.U.," had categorically denied that there was any "Rightist" or even a conciliatory attitude toward "Rightism" in the Politburo of which Rykov had been a member since 1919: "In the Political Bureau there are neither Right nor 'Left' deviations nor a conciliatory attitude towards those deviations. This can be declared categorically. It is time to put a stop to the gossip spread by the enemies of the Party and by the oppositionists of all kinds to the effect that there is a Right deviation, or a conciliatory attitude towards the Right deviation, within the Political Bureau of our Central Committee." *(Leninism,* II, 66)

If Stalin in October 1928 by implication denied that Rykov at that time was a "Right deviationist," where did the G.P.U. ten years later get its basis for dating Rykov's "Rightist" machinations to 1928? The 1928 date and in fact the basic blueprint for the G.P.U. accusa-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tions against Rykov as a "Rightist" and an agent of the "foreign powers" had been laid down by Trotsky. Here is Trotsky's indictment of Rykov in 1928, representing the very roots of Vishinsky's indictment of Rykov in 1938:

"Immediately behind Rykov, come those who, as *Pravda* has already recognized, want to live in peace with all classes—that is to say, want once more to force the worker, the hired man and the poor peasant to submit peacefully to the master. Behind them looms already the small employer, greedy, impatient, vindictive, his arms raised and the knife within reach. And behind the small employer, beyond the frontier, the real boss stands ready with dreadnaughts, airplanes and asphyxiating gases. 'We must not let ourselves become panic stricken. Let us go on building as we have in the past.' That is what the little Judases of the Right are preaching, putting the workers to sleep, mobilizing the property holders, preparing the Thermidor." ("The July Plenum and the Right Danger")

In 1938 Rykov was "confessing" before the whole world: "We adopted all the forms of utilizing the anti-Soviet, bourgeois forces in the countryside for combatting the Party and the government—from utilizing actions that had already matured to the deliberate organization of kulak uprisings." *(Case of A.-S.B.R.T.,* 164)

Did Stalin's GPU have a pattern for putting this "confession" into Rykov's mouth? Yes, Trotsky wrote in 1928: "Rykov is behaving as all petty-bourgeois politicians do, for they always in such a situation stir up the peasant against the Communist by depicting the latter as a bandit and an expropriator." ("July Plenum" etc.). Of course in 1938 Rykov "confessed" to things he had never said or done in 1928. However, there is a trace of something in Trotsky's 1928 incitement against Rykov: "Rykov, on the contrary, leaves certain things unmentioned because he doesn't want to say too much." *(Ib.)*. But in what Rykov happened to say in 1928 Trotsky at that time pretended to see a threat to the existence of the Bolshevik State: "In the speech of Rykov commenting on the resolutions of the July Plenum, the Right wing has thrown down the gage to the October Revolution . . . We say to our Party and to the Communist International: Rykov is beginning openly to surrender the Revolution of October to the enemy classes." *(Ib.)*

Upon the conclusion of the Moscow Trial of March 1938, "The Military Collegium of the Supreme Court of the U.S.S.R. Sentences . . . Rykov, Alexei Ivanovich . . . to the supreme penalty—to be shot . . ." *(Case of A.-S. B.R.T.* 799).*Pravda* and other Stalin papers and the Comintern press assured the workers that by the bloody settlement with the "Rights" and former Oppositionists Stalin had done away with the danger of bourgeois counter-revolution in the Soviet Union. And it was Trotsky who in October 1928 in Alma Ata insisted that a victory of Stalin's apparatus over the "Rights" would

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

not eliminate the "Thermidorian-Bonapartist" prospect but would only alter and delay it—if the victory were not *a bloody one!* During those 1928 Autumn days when the Stalinist fury against the "Right danger" was growing in intensity, Trotsky wrote: "A *bloodless* victory of the Party apparatus of the Centrists over the Right would not do away with the Thermidorian-Bonapartist perspective, but would only change and postpone it." ("On the Situation in Russia," *Militant,* Feb. 1, 1929. Our emph.—G. S.)

This highly inflamatory line represented an effort on Trotsky's part to encourage Stalin not merely to open an attack upon Rykov and others whom Trotsky denounced as "Rights," but to employ against them a policy of *bloody* violence. Trotsky's subtle instigation to spill the blood of the "Rights" was printed and circulated by the Oppositionists. Calling for the blood of the "Rights," Trotsky also made it understood that in the developing crusade against them Stalin must enlist the Oppositionists.

However great Stalin's power was in 1928, he had not yet reached the point at which he could heed Trotsky's instigation and commence piling up "Rightist" corpses in the Lubiankas. Stalin secured his bloody victory over the "Rights," as well as over the "Trotskyites," some years later. And history, with its never-ceasing irony, played a hoax upon Trotsky. After having attempted to incite a bloody extermination of the "Rights" as agents of the bourgeoisie, Trotsky during the Moscow Trials had to pretend their defense because the G.P.U. linked Trotskyites with the "Rights" and indicted both sets of scapegoats on the very charges which Trotsky, in embryonic form, had levelled against the "Rights" in 1928. In consequence, instead of painting Rykov as a "Rightist," the Trotsky paper was compelled to give an opposite color to the man: "A. J. Rykov. One of the most highly honored personages in the Soviet Union." *(Soc. App.,* March 5, 1938)

Trotsky's 1928 incitement against the "Rights" was among the last pieces of the infamous political work he executed on the Russian soil. At the beginning of 1929 the GPU deported him to Turkey.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE CORE OF TROTSKY'S INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT

1. *A Famous Exile*

THE LEON TROTSKY who set foot in Constantinople on February 12, 1929, was in many respects different from the Trotsky who in May 1917 had arrived in Petrograd. Then he had been known almost exclusively within the Russian Socialist circles. But in 1929 very few people in the world had not heard of Leon Trotsky. Despite

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the fact that in the Soviet Union and in the Comintern his name was being damned, the memory of his glittering meteoric career could never be erased. Trotsky, of course, knew that his name was impressive on the international scene. His sensational banishment from the Soviet Union which he had played so important a part in founding attracted universal notice and aroused in many the desire to know the reason for this amazing event. Indeed no sooner had he settled in Turkey than reporters, interviewers and agents of publishing houses flocked to see him and sought to learn his opinion on every important political issue. Through the almost immediate translation of Trotsky's concoctions into various languages he exerted a direct influence on the thinking of the international proletarian vanguard. Here is a sample of the lies he was telling: "In order to defend the October Revolution, the Soviet Republic and the revolutionary name of the Bolshevik-Leninists, I told the whole world the truth about Stalin and the Stalinists." (*Bul. Oppositsii,* No. 1-2; *Militant,* May 1-15, 1929)

Thus, maintaining a dignified and authoritative air Trotsky concealed his own role in building up the Stalinist political system. With great vigor he began to turn out document after document and book after book, all containing some aspect of his "views"—all serving to maintain and fortify the Russian-nationalist burocratic system in Russia.

Trotsky's labors found wide and immediate response. He was highly regarded by many individuals and groups that had either been expelled from the Comintern or had left of their own accord. Some of the leaders of these groups had gone through the whole gamut of factional intrigues and machinations within that body and, having failed to elbow their way to the summit of power, had formed "Oppositional" factions outside the Comintern. Around these formerly eminent figures of the various sections of the Comintern were clustered many honest revolutionary workers who had gone through more or less bitter experiences with the Stalin-selected leaders and were convinced that the Third International was treacherous and counter-revolutionary.

It will be in order to specify a few of the "Opposition" groups. The Italian group organized around the organ *Prometeo* was under the influence of Bordiga who, according to Bukharin (*Pravda,* September 12, 1928), addressed a proposal to the Sixth Congress that Trotsky be made its chairman. A considerable group existed in Austria. The Belgian "Opposition" group led by Van Overstraaten was strong enough to constitute itself a party. In France evolved several "Opposition" groups, one led by Boris Souvarine, another by Pierre Monatte, yet another by Loriot. One French group was headed by Albert Treint who soon evinced defiant skepticism toward Trotsky.

For a short period the most powerful of all the Trotskyist groups was the German. Some years back, its leaders, then in the German Stalinist Party, were known as "Lefts" carrying on a fight for control

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

against the Brandler leadership, attacking the Rightist zigzag, specifically the line of the "Workers Government." Thus the German "Left Opposition" had arisen prior to the Trio's campaign against "Trotskyism." Consequently, it had sprung not from the factional development within the Soviet Union but from the internal factional bickering for power in the German Stalinist Party. The political attitudes of the German Lefts, Ruth Fischer, Urbahns and Maslow, towards Trotsky, and of Trotsky toward them, were determined by the shifts in the factional breezes. Their downfall just preceded the puncturing of Zinoviev's inflated power. It was Zinoviev as the chairman of the Comintern who, with much ingenuity and a great deal of demagogy, had carried out both the installation and the removal of the Lefts. When Zinoviev was forced into the "oppositional" pose they, realizing that a Russian political dye would give a bright Red color to their fictitious revolutionism, swung to supporting Zinoviev, and when Zinoviev made a deal with Trotsky, the German Lefts automatically became adherents of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc.

In 1926 Stalin, at the approaching high stage of the Rightist zigzag, in the process of elimination of all the Lefts from the sections of the Comintern, expelled the Ruth Fischer-Maslow-Urbahns group. A few weeks later Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky in the October 16, 1926 Declaration, with the practical purpose of placating Stalin, disavowed the German Lefts and in an emphatic and official manner pointed them out as deserving reprehension:

"We consider as particularly impermissible any support of the activity of persons such as Ruth Fischer and Maslov who have been expelled from the Party and the Comintern."

But the changes in the factional weather were to bear strange fruit only ten months after that Declaration. Upon the resumption of his sham oppositionism in 1927, Trotsky in the *Platform* took up the defense of the German Lefts. (162-3)

2. *Trotsky's Main American Adherents*

One of the groups which established contact with Trotsky immediately upon his arrival in Turkey was the American group led by Cannon, Abern and Shachtman. This group at once put the full stamp of approval upon Trotsky's "views" and policies and instantly assumed the role of his official American agency. Its services to Trotsky became of special significance because it eventually developed into the fountain-head of Trotskyist ideas. It is therefore fitting to give some details on the origin of this group.

Late in the Summer of 1928, a little over a month after the return of the American Communist Party delegates from the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, the American Party membership was startled by a sensational development. James P. Cannon, a leading member of the Central Executive Committee, head of the Party-controlled Interna-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tional Labor Defense, was discovered to be a supporter of Trotsky. The news spread like a prairie fire among the members of the Party. A few days after the discovery, Cannon and his close associates, Abern and Shachtman, were expelled.

This was a surprising development indeed. Cannon was well known to the workers in the Party and to Party sympathizers. Everyone knew that he had had differences with the Lovestone Central Executive Committee but these differences had been of a purely local, *American* nature. Cannon was known to have been absolutely loyal to the Comintern, to the "Old Guard Bolsheviks" headed by Stalin. He had never evinced vacillation with respect to "Trotskyism," and the record of the proceedings at the Sixth Congress established that on the "Russian question" he acted in unison with the most implacable foes of Trotsky. Nor had he manifested any signs of "Trotskyism" immediately upon his return from the Sixth Congress. Among the Stalinist policies and measures which Cannon had supported were the approval by the Sixth Congress of the action of C.P.S.U. expelling the Trotsky Opposition and the rejection of Trotsky's appeal for reinstatement.

To find the key to Cannon's abrupt shift to Trotsky's "views," it is necessary to assemble the larger pieces of his political history into a comprehensive picture.

3. *A Few Highlights of Cannon's Political Background*

Formerly an editor of a Socialist paper in the West, Cannon entered the American section of the Comintern during its formative period. A mature man politically and organizationally, he at once rose to leadership. The Party from the start was tainted with careerism, and various cliques were struggling for controlling influence. In 1922 Cannon lined up with Ruthenberg, Lovestone and Foster for the liquidation of the "underground" movement and for the creation of the legal Workers (Communist) Party. In the latter part of 1922 Cannon was delegated to the Fourth Congress of the Comintern where he supported Zinoviev, Trotsky and other Russian burocrats in setting up the snare of "Workers Government." He also attended a number of sessions of the Comintern Executive.

During this period the Party fell under the domination of Ruthenberg, Lovestone and Pepper. After some back-stage negotiation Cannon struck up a bargain with Foster to seize control. They formed a bloc supported by Lore, Olgin and others. Under the cover of concocted political issues, a fierce factional war was opened by this bloc against the ruling faction. There were many petty job-hunters hungry for promotion that never came, and many honest revolutionary workers who were dissatisfied with the Ruthenberg-Lovestone policies. These heterogeneous elements only needed leadership. The Foster-Cannon Bloc steadily gained adherents and, pursuing the crusade with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zeal and intelligence, wrested control from Ruthenberg-Lovestone-Pepper at the Third Convention of the Party in December 1923.

Cannon and Foster showered the spoils of victory upon their supporters, at the same time allotting many important jobs to the defeated side to keep down the cry of burocratism. The Cannon-Foster Bloc consolidated its position and arrived to the Fourth Convention of the Party in 1925 backed by the overhwelming majority of the membership.

The Fourth Convention marked the highest watermark of Cannon's career in the Party. Cannon received the honor of reporting for the Central Executive Committee. Another important report, that on the "Bolshevization of the Party," also fell to him.

If the opening phase of the Fourth Convention in August 1925 augured exceptionally well for Cannon, by the closing stage his aspirations were thwarted. The Comintern representative to the American party, Gusev, announced that he had received a decision from Moscow to the effect that the new Central Executive Committee of the American Party should be formed by an equal number from both factions, despite the fact that the Foster-Cannon alliance had received the backing of the vast majority of the membership. Furthermore, Gusev announced, he had been designated by the Kremlin to act as an impartial chairman of the new Central Executive Committee to prevent a deadlock between the Lovestone and the Foster-Cannon forces.

The Cannon-Foster crowd was stunned. Cannon's hard-won triumph had vanished. His opponents, on the other hand, were jubilant. The long-distance machinations in Moscow had more force than the "democratic" methods within the American Party. Gnashing their teeth at the prospect of sharing power with Lovestone, whom Cannon and Foster despised in the most "comradely" fashion, the heads of the Cannon-Foster Bloc reluctantly complied with the order. But then to their amazement and horror Gusev suddenly informed them of certain other, hitherto unrevealed, instructions from Moscow: "Of course we have now a parity C.E.C. but it is not exactly a parity C.E.C. With the decision of the Communist International on the question of the groups in the American party there goes parallel instructions to the C.I. representative to support that group which was the former Minority." (*Daily Worker,* Sept. 3, 1925)

The Cannon-Foster bloc was thus completely deprived of power and was placed in a lower order involving subserviency to the Ruthenberg-Lovestone gang. The transformation was sweepingly imposed. The Cannon-Foster crowd was seized with consternation. Its leaders muttered curses under their breath. Their followers gave vent to bitter resentment by pouring forth abusive language on the followers of the Ruthenberg-Lovestone-Pepper caucus. Foster stubbornly refused to forego his privileges of control and made it plain that he would

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

resist the "parallel instructions." An atmosphere of split was enveloping the Party.

4. *Cannon Knifes Foster*

But those were days of most unexpected occurrences. The Ruthenberg-Lovestone burocrats executed a maneuver calculated to deprive the Foster-Cannon bloc of its numerical strength. On November 16, 1925, under the guidance of Gusev, they presented a "Unity Resolution" whose basic meaning was liquidation of opposition to them in the Party. Cannon saw that he was being involved in a turbulent but hopeless defiance of the victorious faction and, more important, of the Kremlin, and he brought the situation to an exciting climax. Like a bolt out of the blue, Cannon deserted his long-standing ally, Foster, and cast his vote for the Ruthenberg-Lovestone "Unity Resolution."

Cannon's perfidy was such a surprise, such a stab in the back that Foster's resistance collapsed.

Writing a few months after his expulsion from the Communist Party, Cannon made the following true observation: "The direct responsibility of the Stalinist faction for the Lovestone-Pepper regime in our Party and all its corrupting consequences is clearly demonstrated by the facts of Party history in recent years. This leadership was established in the Party in 1925 by cable of the E.C.C.I., after it had twice been decisively rejected by the Party membership." (*Militant,* Feb. 15, 1929). But Cannon wisely omitted very important details concerning his own part in suppressing the will of the membership. Cannon had never explained why he voted for the "Unity Resolution." His vote demonstrated that from his viewpoint this set of corrupt burocrats whom only yesterday he had denounced as putrid opportunists, merited the support and confidence of the membership.

Cannon's "unity" with Lovestone was just as insincere, just as motivated by cold careerist calculations as his previous denunciatory speeches against Lovestone. Cannon saw that for the time being the situation ran counter to his ambitions, and while working with Lovestone he realized that he must build up a powerful caucus of his own.

Contrary to Foster's recent policy of implacable resistance, Cannon aimed to avoid embroilment with Stalin and yet to negate Stalin's decision on the Ruthenberg-Lovestone-Pepper control of the Party. While pretending to accept the "parallel instructions" of the Comintern, Cannon began to sound out some of the lieutenants of the Ruthenberg-Lovestone caucus, tempting them with offers of influential positions if they agreed to a Cannon coup. In fine, he endeavored to break up the Ruthenberg-Lovestone caucus from within, instead of using his 1923-24 tactic of head-on assault. But all his intrigues went awry and the Ruthenberg-Lovestone caucus held together.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

5. *Ruthenberg's Death and the Crisis of Power*

In March 1927 occurred an event of major importance to the ruling faction. Ruthenberg, the most powerful political figure of Stalinism in America, the perpetual Secretary of the Party, died. His death created an explosive situation. There was nervousness among the high-ranking officers of the Party, each stimulated by thoughts of securing more power. Even the atmosphere around Ruthenberg's funeral was saturated with factionalism. "Parity" was established in choosing pall-bearers: three from the ruling faction—Lovestone, Bedacht and Gitlow; three from among the oppositionists—Foster, Cannon and Bittelman.

Lovestone was apprehensive that he would be delivered to his factional enemies by treachery, and this apprehension was well-founded. One of the ring-leaders of his caucus, William W. Weinstone, nicknamed "Wobbly" for his inconsistency, sensed "essential differences" with the chief. Proceeding cautiously Weinstone talked to Cannon and then they approached Foster. Moved by factional hopes Foster showed willingness to forgive Cannon's treasonable conduct. Preparations for a coup were made with the precision of a clock; at an appointed hour the administration of the Party was to be suddenly altered, Lovestone and his close henchmen deprived of power, and a triumvirate of Cannon, Weinstone and Foster was to take over the Central Executive Committee and the key institutions of the Party. They were within an ace of carrying through their daring plot when the whole scheme collapsed like a house of cards. Lovestone got wind of the plot. Acting swiftly he appealed for aid to the Kremlin. The intrigue of Cannon, Weinstone and Foster amounted to a defiance of high authority in Moscow. Stalin put a speedy end to the plot. A cable from the Comintern, threateningly-worded, frightened the Cannon-Foster-Weinstone majority. Lovestone was now firmly fixed in power.

Aflame with rage, the plotters refrained from any outburst which could only lead to their exposure and condemnation before the entire membership, possibly to expulsion. "Wobbly" swallowed his mortification and discovered that after all he did not have any differences with his former chief. Foster resumed his "oppositional" attitude under the cloak of struggle for unity of the Party.

Cannon retreated gloomily with the painful realization that Lovestone's grip on the Party was now more tenacious than ever.

A year and a half later, after Cannon had been expelled for "Trotskyism," he wrote about this plot and gave the facts a twist to place himself in a "favorable" light. He had been motivated, allegedly, by the interests of the workers. His union with the other two political adventurers he painted as conceived in high moral purpose:

"About 18 months ago Comrade Weinstone came to us in alarm with the declaration that the corruption, opportunism and cynicism of the Lovestone group leaders was such that they would destroy the party if they secured control. He supplemented all that we knew of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

them by what he had learned as a member of their faction. He proposed a bloc with us and with the Foster group to secure the Party against this. In our opinion this proposal corresponded with the best interests of the party. The bloc was formed and a majority of the Central Executive Committee was secured in support of it. This majority was set aside by the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the initiative of Bukharin and the Lovestone faction was mechanically entrenched in control of the Party." (*Militant,* Jan. 1, 1929)

Following the frustration of the plot Cannon saw that his position was almost hopeless. Foster, who had a much larger force than Cannon, was at least pampered by the Lovestone clique which tried by various means to appease him. But Cannon's humiliation was not offset by any pampering. Since he had been hurled from his heights in 1925 he had been relegated to the office of the International Labor Defense, an auxiliary of the Party. Yet, although his prospects were dark, Cannon hung on, hoping against hope that the drift of events might bring relief. There was due in the Summer of 1928 the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, and it might prove a turning point. This was Cannon's last straw.

6. *The American Faction-Fight at the Sixth Congress*

During the Spring of 1928 both sides pushed their preparations for a new factional combat. Foster, Cannon, Bittelman and their helpers drew up a long indictment of the Lovestone leadership in a document, "The Right Danger in the American Party." They went to Moscow with an iron determination to put an end to Lovestone's irksome rule. The Lovestone clique, on the other hand, went to Moscow for permission to "rid the Party of the disease of factionalism."

The hot debates betwen the two American factions on the floor of the Sixth Congress became a nuisance to that gathering. The pall of the "American question" hung so heavily over the Congress that "Wobbly" Weinstone, once again a staunch defender of Lovestone, expressed his regret: "Comrades, it is unfortunate that the sessions of the World Congress have been turned into sessions of the Anglo-American Secretariat to study in detail the issues within the American Party." (*Inprecor,* Aug. 11, 1928). And Lovestone offered "apologies" for the discourtesy presumably done to the Congress by Cannon and Foster: "Comrades, I believe the American Party owes an explanation to the Congress for the impermissible performance of some comrades of the delegation that has come here." (Aug. 23, 1928)

Encouraged by the support he received back stage from Stalin's chief of the Comintern, Bukharin, the Lovestone leaders presented their line on the liquidation of the Foster-Cannon alliance: "Therefore we insist that the Opposition should dissolve its bloc (Foster-Cannon). We request that the C.I. should reject the unfounded charge of Right Wing levelled against the C.E.C. We insist that the C.I.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

should once and for all put an end to the factional opposition to the C.E.C." (*Ib.*)

The American Commission of the Comintern made a pretense of studying the "issues" and adopted a decision in support of Lovestone. It became clear, as never before, that Cannon's endeavors to restore his former position in the Party were to no avail. Foster, at least, had some consolation. He was given a place in the Comintern Executive and everything was done to conciliate him. Cannon, on the other hand, was treated frostily in Moscow. This made him fiercely resentful against the Stalin clique, especially in view of his long record of loyal adherence to the line of the Comintern on the Russian and all other extra-American issues! "Each time we went to Moscow full of confidence that this time we were going to get some help, some support, because we were on the right line [supporting the Stalin faction in its drive against Trotsky, support to the betrayals in Germany, China, to the "theory" of Socialism in one country, etc.—G.S.], because our proposals were correct. And each time we were disappointed, cruelly disappointed." (Cannon, *Hist. of American Trotskyism*, 35)

Cannon resolved that this would be his last pilgrimage to Moscow. Cannon came to the realization that his career in the Party and the Comintern was finished, had been finished, in fact, long before the Sixth Congress.

7. *Foster Knifes Cannon*

Cannon, however, was not the man to let his aspirations be stifled in a cul-de-sac. If his career in the Party and in the Comintern was closed, it did not mean that he and his caucus could not try their luck outside. He was realistic enough to understand that under his own flag he could not navigate even a pond, let alone the high sea of international politics within the working class. But there was one "revolutionary" flag well known around the globe, and by holding it aloft Cannon could establish himself as a figure of some stature. This flag was *Trotsky*. There was a growing world-wide movement under Trotsky. Especially "promising" was the German Leninbund organized in April 1928 in Berlin, already numbering six thousand members and boasting tremendous influence. Cannon began to look at the Trotsky flag with increasing respect. Who could tell, perhaps it would open up a new horizon for him and his caucus.

Cannon's lieutenants, Abern and Shachtman, were disposed to look favorably upon their leader's proposal to break the impasse by snapping the organizational threads with the Party and assuming an "independent" role under the Trotsky colors. Much remained to be done. To win the membership of the caucus to the idea of supporting Trotsky after a long diet of venomous "anti-Trotskyism" was no easy task. The leaders of the caucus could overcome the difficulty only by degrees. They issued a circular in which, in very cautious terms, they asked the members of the caucus to keep their minds open regarding

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky. Despite the cautiousness, Cannon's new attitude toward Trotsky burst like a bombshell among his followers and many of them recoiled. Others "opened" their mind and a secret discussion ensued.

The Foster gang, still closely allied with the Cannon caucus, was not long in learning of the discussion, and now Foster repaid Cannon for the 1925 factional treachery. He denounced Cannon as a Trotskyite to the Lovestone Political Committee. Its minutes read: "It has become clear, in recent weeks, that Comrade Cannon, supported by Comrade Abern and Shachtman, is carrying on activities leading to the crystallization of a Trotskyist faction in our Party. Comrade Cannon is making a political platform of such propositions as: keeping an open mind on the question of Trotskyism, studying the question, spreading doubt as to the correctness of the C.I. attitude on the question and urging the need or reexamining it." (*Polcom* No. 58, Oct. 16, 1928, 1-2)

Brought up on the carpet Cannon emphatically denied that he advocated any revision of the position adopted by the Party: "Not a single person can be brought before the Polcom who can truthfully say that I advocated or did anything in connection with the Trotsky question contrary to what has been decided by the Party." (5)

Cannon was playing for time to assemble as many followers in his caucus as possible. But Lovestone cut the game short by ousting Cannon and his captains from the Party within ten days after Foster had denounced his old "friend."

8. *Cannon Rewrites History*

About a year and a half afterward Cannon put out an expertly-woven story of his group's conversion to Trotsky's "Bolshevik-Leninist" line. He announced that his Trotskyism was by no means a recent conversion but had been growing upon him during his struggle against the Lovestone faction. Completely covering up the fact that *all* of the factional leaders in the American Party were firmly united on one point—loyalty to the Stalin regime—Cannon palmed off the story that the careerist clique fights had an inner principled political significance. Upon this, supposedly principled, battlefield the Lovestone tendency, in Cannon's words, had consolidated its Rightism while his own group had solidified itself upon the line of Trotsky's International Left Opposition:

"We were one of the latest detachments of the International Communist Opposition to take definite shape in the open just as the Lovestone group is a somewhat belated reinforcement in the rear of the international right wing. Neither of these American factions however found its international connection by accident. We were 'prepared by the past' for our place under the banner of the International Left Opposition. Lovestone and Co. served their apprenticeship and became journeymen opportunists, qualified for union with Brandler, in the American Party struggles. The protracted period of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

our gestation as a faction *on the line of the* Bolshevik-Leninists has not been without compensating advantages. The rich experiences of the International struggle were realized for us, as it were in advance, and we have been able to build on their foundations. This insured for us a clearer perspective and tactical line." (*Militant,* May 10, 1930, 6)

It did not disturb Cannon in the least that the story of "gestation as a faction on the line of the Bolshevik-Leninists" was widely divergent from actual facts. It was not the first nor the last time that Cannon presented fictitious political narratives. But inside Cannon's organization this "gripping" tale failed to grip most of his followers, and many of them rejected it as a brazen lie. It must be indicated that a few months after the Cannon group had raised the Trotsky banner, a long acrimonious squabble broke out among the leaders. In June 1932 Shachtman, Abern and Glotzer issued an internal document which makes fascinating reading. It was titled "The Situation in the American Opposition: Prospect and Retrospect." Here is what this document said regarding the gestation story:

"Theoretically, the contention does not rest upon a shred of real evidence. The old Cannon group in the party was not 'developing logically' was not 'gestating' towards the Left Opposition. It never had a firm programmatic foundation during its separate existence. It was never considered by anyone, least of all by itself, as situated at the Left Wing of the party. It came into existence independently (following its break with the Foster faction, out of which it came in 1925) at the time when the Zinoviev-Stalin-Bukharin group was consummating its organizational-political victory in the United States by arbitrarily overthrowing the Foster regime and establishing the Lovestone-Pepper regime. The Cannon group united with the Right wing, (Lovestone, etc.) against the Foster group. When it finally broke its alliance with the Right wing, it again maintained an independent existence for a while essentially as a buffer between Foster and Lovestone. Prior to the Sixth Congress it formed an Opposition bloc with Foster-Bittelman which it maintained virtually till the eve of our expulsion." (13)

In brief, Cannon's contention was an impudent and shameless lie. While exposing Cannon's lie, however, the authors of the document neglected to mention that when the "gestation" story was published in *The Militant,* Shachtman and Abern were editors of the periodical. It was with Shachtman's and Abern's connivance that Cannon had his "gestation" fraud published and palmed off upon the revolutionary workers.

The internal document further showed that the Cannon group had never been interested in such questions as "Socialism in one country" and had really been the least "international" group in the American Stalinist Party:

"But it would further be established that on every fundamental

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

question of principle, the Cannon group stood upon the platform of international Stalinism, sometimes a little to the Right of it and sometimes a little to the Left of it. While very few of its leaders—to their credit—ever engaged actively in the campaign against 'Trotskyism,' the group nevertheless had no political affinity with the Left Opposition. If anything, it was the least 'international' of all the party groups, and concerned itself less than any others with such questions as the British general strike, and the Anglo-Russian Committee, the Chinese revolution, or the struggle within the Russian party although the interest of the other groups was purely factional. It spent more time upon secondary tactical questions in this country than upon a discussion of theory of socialism in one country, upon which it did indeed spend no time at all." (*Ib.*)

We don't have to go far afield to furnish more evidence that Cannon's story was a shabby fabrication. Cannon himself immediately upon the establishment of the Trotskyist group had declared that he and his co-workers had arrived at their Trotskyism *only recently:* "We are late in learning the truth, late with the performance of our international duty, but that is by no means entirely or even mainly, our fault. It was possible for us to secure adequate information and judge for ourselves only recently." (*Militant,* Nov. 15, 1928)

It is not hard to undertsand Cannon's motive in introducing his "gestation" pretense. He wanted to become *the* leader of his organization *in a very special sense.* But his scheme, as we have said, ran into strong resistance. A few remarks in the invaluable internal document indicate that Cannon's factional opponents understood exactly what was about:

"At the same time, however we have not been unmindful of the negative and dangerous aspects of the 'gestation' theory and especially of its practical consequences. It has served to establish an atmosphere of 'hereditary succession', so to speak, in the organization to attach in the minds of the comrades a special privileged significance to those who once formed a part of the Cannon group in the party. It was on the basis of the same theory that Comrade Swabeck, when he came to the center early in 1931 as an 'objective comrade who would help establish harmony in the Committee' informed Glotzer that the basis for the establishment of unity in the Committee was an acknowledgement of 'Cannon as *the* leader of the League.' However little we were concerned with Swabeck's ridiculous preoccupation as to who (if anybody!) should be 'the' leader (and by 'acknowledgement' at that!), we nevertheless respectfully decline comrade Swabeck's ingenious proposal." (15)

This brief review gives the reader an idea of the unprincipled character of the American Trotskyist leadership and the burocratic basis on which Trotsky's American section was founded.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XXII.

STALIN, TROTSKY AND THE RISE OF HITLER

1. *A New Crisis of German Capitalism*

THE 1929 CRISIS, sweeping all capitalist countries, found its sharpest expression in Germany.

Stalin as well as Trotsky, and even the leaders of the bourgeoisie, knew that Germany could no longer continue as a capitalist-democractic republic.

To prevent proletarian upheaval, the German capitalists had to fasten the yoke of Fascism upon the country. Stalin probably realized that a Fascist Germany meant eventual war upon the Soviet Union. However, since Stalin's power in the Bolshevik State and in the Comintern had not yet reached a high degree of centralization, his military machine not yet strong enough to march through Poland into Germany and risk a world imperialist resistance, while the spectre of a proletarian upheaval in Central Europe was rising, he had no alternative but to help the bourgeoisie establish a Fascist rule in Germany. He could see that the German imperialists would require many years to overcome numerous internal and external obstacles before they could emerge powerful enough to advance upon his domain. By then, he undoubtedly figured, the economic and therefore the military might of the Soviet Union would be sufficiently great to defeat the attack.

The financial and industrial magnates of Germany were feverishly forging the Fascist sledge hammer to strike a mortal blow at the working class. Meanwhile the Comintern with its pseudo-revolutionary deceptions and the Second International with its dignified "democratic" quackery kept the German proletariat in a perpetual daze. Thus, the three great forces, Fascism, Social Democracy and the Stalinist burocracy, to all appearances bitterly antagonistic to one another on the German issue, were, each in its own way, acting as saviors of German capitalism.

2. *Trotsky's Pretense at Reforming Stalin's Comintern*

The central sham in Trotsky's politics was "the policy of reforming the Comintern." Most anti-Stalin revolutionary workers, therefore, easily fell victim to the delusion that at some point in the train of events the Comintern would begin to act as a revolutionary force and would lead the masses against the world bourgeoisie and the Soviet burocracy. Nevertheless rumors were rife that Trotsky favored the idea of forming a new International. At the first opportune occasion Trotsky squelched the idea: "All talk of my planning a 4th International is sheer nonsense. The Social Democratic International, just as the Communist International, has deep historical roots. No intermediary (2½) or additional (4) International *will* be needed. There is no room for them." (Replies to the Questions of the Corres-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

pondent of the Japanese paper, "Osaka Mainichi." *Bulleten Opp.* No. 1-2, 29)

Performing the function of a shepherd dog for the Comintern, Trotsky worked to prevent the revolutionary workers from breaking away from the Stalinist system. Curtly and dogmatically his theses declared that the Stalin Party was the Party of the Trotsky Opposition: "The Left Opposition does not seek to constitute a second party; on the contrary, it categorically repudiates all tendencies in that direction. The party of the Opposition is the Communist Party." (*Militant,* July 25, 1931, 3)

Although Trotsky eventually had to abandon his pretense of revolutionizing the Comintern, he was able for a long time to prevail upon his followers to squander their energies on "reforming" the Stalinist trap: "It would be a criminal act on the part of the Opposition Communists to take, like Urbahns and Co., to the road of creating a new Communist Party, before making some serious efforts to change the course of the old party." (*Germany, What Next?* 184)

Trotsky assured his followers that a move in the direction of a new International would be stepping into a Stalinist snare: "The Stalinists by their persecution would like to push us on the road of a second party and the Fourth International. They understand that a fatal error of this type on the part of the Opposition, if it would not nullify altogether all its successes, would for years slow up its ascent." (*Militant,* July 9, 1932)

3. *The "Red Referendum"*

By the summer of 1930 the crisis in Germany reached an acute stage. The general elections of September 14, 1930 indicated a sharp turn in the situation. The menace of Fascism suddenly loomed immense. While the German Social Democracy still held the first place among the political parties, and the Stalin party rolled up an impressive vote—"Our Party gained about 1,300,000 votes" (*Militant,* Nov. 1, 1930)—the Nazis made a spectacular leap from 809,939 votes in 1928 to *six million four hundred thousand*! Startling in its swiftness and magnitude this jump spoke more imperiously to the workers and in clearer terms than the gloomiest of prophets.

Acting on the basis of their strength, the Fascists in the summer of 1931 sought by a "democratic" maneuver, permitted under the Republican Constitution, to oust the Social Democratic-Liberal coalition government of Prussia. The Fascist deputies of the Prussian Landtag proposed a referendum by the body of the voters of Prussia for the dissolution of the Landtag. If the measure received the approval of fifty per cent of the entire Prussian electorate, a Nazi administration would be installed in Berlin, capital of Prussia and of Germany. The Social Democrats, with the Fascist knife suspended over their heads, timidly reacted by asking the voters to abstain from the polls. Not really defending the "democratic" form of rule, except against the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

threat of proletarian revolution, they decided to leave the vital matter of Hitler's attempt to gain power by constitutional means to the shifting winds of parliamentary balloting.

Stalin saw the opportunity to install Hitler in power and thus bring a rapid political stability to the German capitalist society. His Comintern Executive commanded the puppets in charge of the German Party to align the millions of Communist voters behind the Fascist move. For a moment the German Stalinist leaders were dismayed. They felt that the method of aiding Hitler was too obvious and might serve as a spark for a flaming scandal. But Stalin knew the magic powers of the October banner in which the Comintern was draped. His German puppets were given to understand that the order was conclusive and absolute. They bowed in obedience. A leading Russian Stalinist burocrat, in his own words, recorded the change: "You know, for example, that the leadership of the Party opposed taking part in the referendum on the dissolution of the Prussian Landtag. A number of the Party newspapers published leading articles opposing participation in that referendum. But when the Central Committee of the Party jointly with the Comintern arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to take an active part in the referendum, the German comrades in the course of a few days, roused the whole Party." (O. Piatnitsky, *The Work of the Communist Parties of France and Germany,* 3)

To give the maneuver a "Red" disguise, the Stalin deputies in the Prussian Landtag introduced a resolution essentially of the same content as the one presented by the Fascists but couched in vivid "revolutionary" phrases. The *Inprecor* dated July 23, 1931 inadvertently bared the crudeness of the Stalin maneuver: "The People's Referendum referred to by the Communist diet fraction is the Referendum which has been organized by the Fascist and German Nationalist Parties. Its fate at the moment is uncertain, but with Communist support its victory would be made certain and the Prussian government overthrown."

Proclaimed as a bold stroke of revolutionary strategy, the Fascist proposition was relabelled "Red Referendum." From one end of Germany to the other, the 38 Stalin daily publications, numerous speakers and Party functionaries, who cared only about maintaining their personal stand with the Comintern, and the hopelessly benighted honest rank-and-file worked as a harmonious whole to get the masses of Prussia to vote for the proposition. They were spurred on by Stalin's Russian press: "Failure to participate in the referendum would signify that the Communists support the present reactionary Landtag." (*Pravda,* July 24, 1931)

Since the mainstay of the Prussian Government was the Social Democracy, and the Comintern at this time was on its ultra-Left course, the Stalin maneuver was perfectly in line with the prevalent Comintern thesis that Social Democracy was the chief enemy of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

workers. Diverting attention from the growing danger of Fascism, the Stalinist burocrats on the eve of the "Red Referendum" instructed their followers: "All the resources of the party must be thrown into the fight against Social Democracy." (*Com. Int.* July 1931, No. 25-26, 1154)

The Stalin burocrats were no more sincere in their venomous attacks against Social Democracy during the Leftist periods then in their honeyed offers of "unity" to Social Democracy in the Rightist zigzags. They made use of Social Democracy at all times.

Once the Fascist proposition was labeled "Red" the German puppets of Stalin had no difficulty in arraying their followers for a "fight" against Social Democracy and therefore for ousting the Socialist-Liberal government of Prussia. Older revolutionary workers could not forget August 4, 1914 when Social Democracy had openly united with the Kaiser and German imperialism on the War. Those workers remembered the appalling blood-bath instituted by the Social Democrat Noske in 1919. To the young workers pretty convincing evidence that Social Democracy and the capitalists stood firmly together was the behavior of the Berlin Social Democratic Chief of Police, Zoergiebel, who had ordered the shooting of the Stalin workers in the 1929 May Day parade.

At length the day of the Referendum dawned, Sunday, August 9, 1931. Berlin and other cities and towns of Prussia presented a spectacle which made many a hardened reactionary rub his eyes in wonder. A stream of the most militant Left workers came in an unbroken progression to the polls to support an undertaking from which, if successful, the Nazis would reap the advantage.

Separately the Fascists and the Stalinists would have made a poor showing; together they formed an impressive display, rolling up almost ten million votes but falling short of the goal: "9,793,603 electors voted in favor of the dissolution of the Prussian Diet. In Berlin out of 3,345,523 electors 1,043, 929 voted for the dissolution of the Diet. There are 26,400,000 electors in Prussia, so that the necessary fifty per cent was not reached." ("The Result of the Referendum in Prussia," *Inprecor,* Aug. 13, 1931, 780). Stalin's maneuver to aid Hilter to power in 1931 failed.

4. *The Trotskyites and the "Red Referendum"*

Commenting upon the result of the August 9, 1931 balloting, the Trotskyites gave all the appearance of gloating over the failure of the Stalin-Hitler joint enterprise: "The referendum on the dissolution of the Prussian Diet initiated by the German Fascists and behind which the German Stalinists drew their followers in a miserable and disastrous caricature of a 'united front', came to an end last Saturday, with a vote a few millions short of the amount necessary to accomplish the desired end." (*Militant,* Aug. 15, 1931)

It must be observed that the Trotskyist condemnation of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Stalin line came *after* the event. The question is, what was the Trotsky policy on the Stalin maneuver *before* August 9, 1931? It so happened that Trotsky had a representative in the Prussian Landtag. During a debate on the Fascist and the Stalinist motions on the dissolution of the Prussian Landtag he presented the official Trotsky line: "We print below the full text of the speech delivered by our Comrade Oscar Seibold member of the Left Opposition of the Prussian Landtag at the session of July 8, 1931, in debate on the referendum recently held." (*Militant,* Aug. 29, 1931)

This German Trotsky supporter was in an uncommonly advantageous position to influence the most advanced workers. To what use he put his special station he made patent in his speech. Introducing himself as a member of the "Left Wing" of the Stalin Party, Oskar Seibold proclaimed his political adherence to that Party: "Organizationally and officially, I do not belong to the Communist Party, for reasons which it would be inopportune to explain here, but which are outside my will. *Politically* and revolutionary, I belong *entirely* to the Communist Party and take my place in its Left Wing." (*Ib.* Our emph. G.S.)

Pretending to believe that the Nazis and the Stalin flunkeys stood in opposition to each other on the issue of the dissolution of the Landtag, Seibold announced: "I shall vote against the referendum proposed by the Fascist organizations and *will naturally vote for the proposal of the Communist fraction for the dissolution of the Landtag,* because the proletariat, as I have said has no interest in the preservation of this parliament, or in the preservation of parliamentarism in general; *our aim is the extra-parliamentary revolution in permanency, the Soviet republic of Germany* in a Soviet Europe as the bridge to the world Socialist federation."

Thus by his *concrete* action the Trotsky stooge in the Prussian Landtag showed that the tendency he represented was an organic part of the Stalinist system. The reader will have noted that in the passage just cited there are two parts emphasized. The first is stressed by us to call attention to the fact that the man, introduced by Cannon and Shachtman as "our comrade Oscar Seibold member of the Left Opposition of the Prussian Landtag," aided Stalin in the maneuver to throw the revolutionary workers behind the Fascist campign. The second emphasized part is stressed by the Trotsky leaders. Seibold, by means of "revolutionary" rhetoric masked his actual support to the Fascist proposal. Cannon and Shachtman put Seibold's "revolutionary" rhetoric in bold type to divert the reader's attention from the words which reveal the Trotskyite support to Stalin's pro-Nazi maneuver.

While Trotsky, having a vivid bird's eye view of the German political scene, offered no official "criticism" of the Stalin campaign until it was over, his lackey in the Prussian Landtag radiated confidence in the proposition which aimed to bring the Nazis to power.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

After the Referendum Trotsky pointed out that the Liberal-Social Democratic Government could have been replaced only by the Fascist Dictatorship: "To come out into the streets with the slogan 'Down with the Bruening-Broun government!' at a time when according to the relation of forces, it can only be replaced by a government of Hitler-Hugenberg, is the sheerest adventurism." (*Militant*, Sep. 19, 1931). Of course, there was nothing adventuristic in Stalin's maneuver. It was a calculated, cold-blooded attempt to utilize a political conjuncture for placing Fascism in control of Germany and stabilizing the tottering structure of German capitalism. Trotsky, who understood in what direction government power would shift if the Hitler-Stalin endeavor were crowned with success, aided Stalin through Seibold with full cognizance of the aim of Stalin's policy. The very fact that neither Trotsky nor his closest lieutenants, Cannon and Shachtman, uttered a *single word* of repudiation of Seibold's vote in the Prussian Landtag serves as a fitting illustration of their duplicity in the issue. The printing of Seibold's speech in *The Militant* was obviously an editorial blunder, for the speech reveals the Trotsky support to Stalin's and Hitler's line on the dissolution of the Landtag.

When the Nazi-Stalin referendum faded out of workers' memory, the Trotsky leaders gave free rein to their boasts: "The German Opposition has taken a position on the most important political events in so far as it lay within the realm of its ability. Before the Referendum in Prussia, it took an unequivocal position against the 'Red' Referendum of the Communist Party (carried on in common with the Fascists) in its paper, the *Permanent Revolution*." (*Militant*, March 19, 1932. 3)

Over Seibold's support to the Stalin-Hitler maneuver for the dissolution of the Prussian Landtag, the Trotsky leaders drew the mantle of oblivion.

5. *Trotsky's Double Line on Comintern Burocrats*

Trotsky could cull any number of instances to show the political leprosy of the Comintern burocrats. Whenever they struck at their Trotskyist cousins-under-the-skin, the Trotskyites gave free tongue to their embittered feelings: "What cynicism, what brutality and coarseness, what disregard of the interests of the proletariat of the Russian October, mark this Stalin and his conscienceless *chinovniks*, the Molotovs, Thaelmanns, Fosters, Minors, Cachins! With one hand they wave the red flag of the revolutionary proletariat and with the other they persecute and even shoot the best fighters of October and the international revolution." (*Militant*, March 1, 1930)

But Trotsky and his associates always presented at least two lines on every vital question. Consequently on the nature of the Comintern burocrats there were two diametrically opposite characterizations. One was apparently accurate, the other, the *basic* one which was offered to the workers as a political line, was deceitful. This basic line the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky leaders put forth on every important political occasion. In one of Trotsky's most popularized books on the German situation *What Next?* the Comintern burocrats were advertised as misled revolutionists: "No, the Social democratic leaders represent the agencies of the class enemy within the proletariat. The Communist leaders, though confused, poor, and incapable, are revolutionists or semi-revolutionists that have been led from the right track. That is not one and the same thing. The Social democracy must be destroyed. The Communist Party must be corrected." (113)

Once Trotsky made the workers imagine that the basically dishonest Thaelmanns, Neumanns and Fosters were fundamentally sincere and trustworthy, it was easy to pretend that these burocrats could be brought upon a revolutionary track.

The Stalinist standard-bearer in the German presidential elections, Thaelmann, was painted by the whole Comintern press as a sterling leader of the masses. On this issue too Trotsky lent Stalin a hand: "The candidacy of Thaelmann to the presidency is, self-evidently, the candidacy of the Left Opposition." (191)

And in the election campaign which the Comintern burocrats conducted among the deluded masses of Germany, Trotsky instructed his followers to be in the forefront: "In the struggle for the mobilization of workers under the banner of the official Communist candidacy, the Bolshevik-Leninists must be in the front line." (*Ib.*)

6. *Trotsky Supplies an Issue to his Followers*

During the 1930-33 crisis in Germany the chief feature in Trotsky's politics was the pretense that if the Stalin burocrats formed a united front with Social Democracy the German working class would conquer Fascism. Accordingly, he and his lieutenants exerted "pressure" upon the Comintern for collaboration with Social Democracy and hailed every sign of a turn toward this tactic. The Trotsky workers, naturally, did not know that in 1923 the Trio and Trotsky had conducted not merely a united front but had formed coalition governments with Social Democracy in Saxony and Thuringia to insure a defeat for the German workers.

Trotsky spun political fairy tales to support his pretended expostulations with the Comintern to form a united front with Social Democracy. He cleverly drew upon the Rightist "united front" maneuver which Stalin with his active support had carried out back in 1926 in England. That "united front," be it recalled, was the Anglo-Russian Committee which served as a Left screen for the British trade union leaders in the sell-out of the General Strike. Now, to buttress his line for a united front between the Comintern and Social Democracy, Trotsky gave the impression that the Comintern's 1926 tactic had been in the interests of the workers. In his pamphlet *The Only Road* he declared: "In 1926, the Comintern sought to 'expose' the reformist leaders with the aid of the united front policy, and that was

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

right." (55). Exploiting this deceitful parallel to the full, he concluded: "If the method of the united front was good in 1926, why should it be bad in 1932?" (*Ib.*)

7. *Separating the Leadership from the Party*

Along with his pretense at revolutionizing the Comintern, Trotsky made an artificial separation of the Stalin leadership from the parties this leadership dominated politically and organizationally. On the basis of this invented cleavage Trotsky repeatedly instructed his forces to work for the strengthening of the Stalin organization in Germany. "The strength of our Party is our strength." (*Militant,* Feb. 1, 1931)

The Left Trotskyites of the Leninbund and others instinctively felt that it was in the interest of the workers to destroy, not to build, the Stalin organization. Trotsky took them severely to task. Identifying the interests of the Stalin Party with that of the proletarian vanguard he wrote: "These sprouts of ultra-Leftism rejoice over every failure of the Communist Party, and hope superstitiously that out of the failures of the proletarian vanguard there will somehow grow up their own power. With these sectarians, who in Germany play all the colors of the rainbow, we have not and can not have anything in common. For us, the victory of our policies depends not upon a weakening but a strengthening of the Communist Party." (*Ib.*)

But the line of strengthening the Communist Party which meantime showed no sign of adopting a revolutionary policy aroused misgivings among Trotsky's followers. They dimly perceived that in actuality this was a policy of augmenting the prestige and influence of Stalin's henchmen—that there could be no political separation of the leadership from the Party. In his letter Trotsky attempted to extinguish this healthy spark of understanding: "But is it correct to say that a strengthening of the influence of the Communist party in the ranks of the German proletariat leads to a strengthening of the present leadership? No, that is not correct. This is the essential contention, false to the core, of all and every sort of ultra-Left and pseudo-Left sectarianism." (*Ib.*)

Although individual advanced anti-Stalin workers here and there escaped from Trotsky's snare, the overwhelming majority of his followers faithfully and systematically made every effort to aid "our Party" in gaining popularity and influence. Thus, in the September 1930 elections in Germany the Trotsky group aided the Thaelmann machine in sending as many Stalin burocrats to the Reichstag as possible. The Trotsky "comrades" were in rapturous delight over the result of their exertions: "We exerted our efforts to assist the Party to success. The cadres of the Left Opposition who worked in every part of Germany side by side with the Party comrades, have every reason to be joyous at the success attained by our Party." (*Militant,* Nov. 1, 1930)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Stalinist work of the Trotsky leaders and members put them in a very odd position. Swearing that the Stalin party was revolutionary, that it was their own, they called upon the workers to support it. Yet the Stalin Party, both the leadership and the proletarian rank-and-file, actively and vigorously rejected the Trotskyite support. The Stalin Party members fairly choked with rage at the very sight of the Trotskyite "Social Fascists." They often vented their fury by attacking the Trotskyites physically. But the Trotskyites persevered in their course with stoic unconcern for insult and physical injury. With intensified zeal they continued to express their faith in the ultimate "regeneration" of the Stalin Party. When Hitler came to power and tramped upon the German proletariat which lay shackled by Stalin and Social Democracy, Trotsky, with a touch of pride, remarked upon the enduring loyalty of his direct victims to the Stalin Party: "Under the perfidious blows of the Stalinist bureaucracy, the Left Opposition maintained to the very end its fidelity to the official party." (*Militant*, April 8, 1933)

8. *Hitler In Power*

In the three years of severe crisis in Germany the Communist Party performed herculean labors in disorienting millions of militant German workers. The burocrats diverted the workers' attention from the danger of Fascism: "Nothing could be more fatal than an opportunist overestimation of Hitler Fascism" declared Thaelmann in February 1932. Spreading confusion, the Stalin burocrats declared that Social Democrats were Fascists and that the main blow must be struck at Social Democracy not at the Nazis. The Communist Party drew its followers close to the Nazis through the tactic of the "Red Referendum" and other indirect acts of support to Hitler. After the Nazis in hardly a year more than doubled their strength (July 1932 election) the official magazine of the Comintern told the workers about four months before the German bourgeoisie installed Fascism in power: "It may seem that in Germany, at the present time, for example, the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie is Fascism, and that, therefore, we should deal the chief blows against Fascism. This is not correct." (*Com. Int.* Oct. 15, 1932, 674). Finally, the Stalin burocrats rendered a valuable service to Hitler by spreading the paralyzing idea that the coming of the Nazis to power would be a prelude to proletarian revolution. The bourgeois historians could never understand this thesis: "Until well on in the year 1932 German Communists were obeying the strange order that Hitler's seizure of power must be actually encouraged, because the path to Communism must go by way of the rule of Fascism and its collapse." (Konrad Heiden, *A History of National Socialism,* 154)

Supported by the core of the German petty bourgeoisie, backed by the most powerful financial-industrial interests at home and abroad, and indirectly aided by Stalin-Trotsky and Social Democracy,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Nazis reached the apex of their influence in July 1932, increasing their seats in the Reichstag from 107 to 230. Dramatic as the showing was, it proved to be the limit of Nazi parliamentary expansion under the Weimar Republic. The November 1932 Reichstag elections marked a sharp break in the Nazi hold upon the most backward sections of the petty-bourgeoisie and the working class. The tide was now sweeping away from Hitler. He lost two million votes, the Nazi representation in the Reichstag fell from 230 to 195, and his movement began to disintegrate very rapidly. Social Democracy also found its influence waning. Having lost ten seats in July, it now lost 12 more and about a million voters. The direction of the political tide was unmistakeable. In contrast to the losses of the Nazis and the Social Democrats, the Stalinists gained about a million votes. The Stalinist representation in the Reichstag increased from 89 to one hundred. Clearly the workers of Germany, becoming revolutionary-minded, were expressing their mood by voting for the Party which they believed would lead them into battle against Hitler and Capitalism.

Stalin and his gang were very much frightened by the prospect of a powerful proletarian explosion in Germany. Three weeks after the elections *The New York Times* of November 23, 1932 wrote editorially: "In Moscow, writes Mr. Duranty, there is one menace which is feared above all others, and it is the outbreak of a revolution in Germany or elsewhere in Europe." Trotsky, of course, was feeding the workers the fraud that Stalin's Party in Germany had a revolutionary aim: "The only party whose vote against Papen was dictated by revolutionary purposes is the Communist Party. But it is a long way from revolutionary purposes to revolutionary achievements." (*The Only Road,* 93, Sep. 14, 1932)

It was obvious to the imperialists that the German bourgeoisie had to replace "democracy" with Fascism before the Nazi movement disintegrated. On the 30th of January 1933, von Hindenburg, who had been elected to the presidency by the Social Democratic workers as a "lesser evil," appointed Hitler Chancellor of Germany. Von Hindenburg had taken the oath to uphold the bourgeois democratic republic. But since the struggle in capitalist society runs along the *class* cleavage of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, not along the line of bourgeois democracy against Fascism, the transfer from a bourgeois democratic to a Fascist form of capitalist rule was smoothly performed by the President of the "democratic" republic. He "forgot" his promise of loyalty to bourgeois democracy and, to save Capitalism, promoted to power a man who swore to wipe out all vestiges of that democracy.

Social Democracy performed its part. Not only did it not lift a finger to defend the working class, but it did not even make a pretense of protecting bourgeois democracy. A large number of Social Democratic deputies of the Reichstag voted confidence in Hitler's policy. However, Fascism, predicated upon the complete elimination

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of bourgeois democracy, wiped out Social Democracy as an organized movement. Severing and other high leaders of German Social Democracy, as well as a host of Liberals, were accepted by Hitler into his fold.

The Stalin role in the events in Germany brought to the surface the anti-Stalin undercurrent in many sections of the Comintern. In revulsion against Stalin's policy, thousands of advanced workers severed their organizational connections with the Comintern. Searching for a true revolutionary policy they turned their eyes upon the organization directed by Trotsky. Having realized that Stalin's policy had facilitated the Fascist development, they remembered that Trotsky had "criticised" that policy. In their mind all the Comintern calumnies against Trotsky fell away and he suddenly stood before them as a tried, honest revolutionist.

9. *Germany and the Italian Road*

Since the early period of the Nazi movement, the Comintern used an infinite variety of mental narcotics to produce political stupor among the Communist workers. A soothing opiate, since Germany in some respects was different from Italy, was that Germany would not follow the road of Italian Fascism. The feeding of this opiate to the Comintern workers began almost ten years before Hitler took power: "But Germany is not Italy." (E. Hollein, *Inprecor*, Nov. 15, 1923, 812). "But Germany is not Italy." (Zinoviev, 813)

As was to be anticipated, in swiftness of action and mass extermination of the vanguard workers, Hitler surpassed Mussolini. But even when the similarity of the terror features was already quite pronounced, the Stalin henchmen continued the same line of deception. Fritz Heckert, member of the German Stalin Central Committee, safely outside Hitler Germany, wrote: "German fascism cannot be compared with Italian Fascism." (*What is Happening in Germany*, 12). And the Russian Stalin burocrat Piatnitsky assured the workers that "Germany in 1933 is not like Italy in 1922." (*The Present Situation in Germany*, 42)

Assuming an air of indignation over the treacherous delusion that Germany could not travel the road of Italy, the Trotsky leaders burst into windy criticism:

"A damnable and blighting catch phrase ran through the ranks of the German proletariat, wandering through all the organizations of the working class. They consoled each other with it. It was thought up and set in circulation by frightened, helpless burocrats, at their wits' end. 'Germany is not Italy', 'Germany is not Italy',—in pompous and heroic speeches and numberless newspaper articles, the incantation was thrown again and again at the masses. 'Germany is not Italy.' This mystical dictum, not good enough to hypnotize rabbits, was considered sufficiently potent to put to sleep the best organized working class of the capitalist world. 'Germany is not Italy' blabbered the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

degenerate Social democratic burocrats out the windows of their offices. 'Germany is not Italy' echoed in the high places of the Stalinist Comintern, in the Communist Party of Germany, in all other sections of the C.I." (*Militant,* June 24, 1933)

The Trotsky leaders gave vent to this verbal outburst in the midst of shocking reports of savage brutalities in Germany. In the same article, with great pride, they cited Trotsky's words written in November 1931 to prove that the Trotskyites had warned the workers against such a fatal delusion:

"The Left Opposition raised its voice in warning: 'The coming of the German Nazis to power would mean, first of all, the destruction of the flower of the German proletariat, the annihilation of its organizations, the eradication of its belief in itself and in its future.

"In accordance with the greater maturity and acuteness of the social contradictions prevalent in Germany, the hellish work of the Italian Fascism will probably appear as a pale, almost humane, experiment, in comparison with the work of the German National Socialists.' " (*Ib.*)

The Trotsky leaders pressed their seemingly honest attack, pointing out the cold-blooded cynicism of the Stalin and Social Democratic burocrats at the time the Nazi butchers were exterminating the revolutionary workers: "The burocrats, left without any plausible arguments, maligned and persecuted us and attempted to hide their pannicky helplessness behind the phrase: 'Germany is not Italy!' This they still chanted when the boots of the Nazi storm troopers were already trampling to the ground the most active proletarian forces of Germany." (*Ib.*)

We have noted that the Trotsky leaders, while excoriating the Comintern and Social Democracy, proudly displayed Trotsky's words written in 1931. But the Trotsky record contained another landmark on this matter. On April 8, 1933, *The Militant* had carried the following Stalinist deception: "It would be patently stupid to believe that the subsequent evolution of Germany will go the Italian road; that Hitler will strengthen his domination step by step without serious resistance; that German Fascism will enjoy long years of domination."

The above was penned by Trotsky! In their spirited tribute to Trotsky's record, the editors of *The Militant* witheld from view this line of Trotsky's which in essence said *Germany is not Italy!* The editors of *The Militant* handled the matter about the Italian road with technical expertness. Their problem was to shield Trotsky, to wear the mask of furious criticism of the Comintern and Social Democracy, and to keep up the pretense that the Left Opposition had fought with fine courage and had armed its followers with correct lucid directives. To accomplish this task, the Trotsky henchmen chose those quotations which could serve as a strong buttress for their chief but concealed the evidence of his aid from 1923 on to the peddlers of the opiate "Germany is not Italy."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Having crammed the heads of the anti-Stalin revolutionary workers with "analyses" and "prognoses" which were refuted and exposed by history, the Trotskyite leaders declared with a perfectly straight face: "The correctness of our methods, our predictions and our slogans have been incontestibly proved through the entire historic development of the last ten years . . ." (*Militant,* March 31, 1934)

This lie became the "history" of the six years of the existence of the American Trotsky group: "In six years the *Militant* had gained the respect of the entire revolutionary movement of the world for its honesty, its *clean* methods and above all for the *clarity* and *correctness* of its policies." (*Militant,* Dec. 8, 1934, Our emph.—G.S.)

10. *The Question of Consciousness of Purpose*

That the policy of betrayal of revolution was conscious on the part of the Stalin gang was quite clear to the imperialists. We have quoted *The New York Times* editorial of November 23, 1932 which referred to Stalin's fear of revolution in Germany or elsewhere in Europe. Any Comintern worker who chanced upon this valuable piece of information would have indignantly rejected it as a slanderous capitalist lie. Unfortunately in this instance the bourgeoisie did not lie—just as the Mensheviks and Eastman did not lie about Lenin's Testament. It was Stalin and Trotsky who in both cases deceived the workers.

But the Trotsky workers too did not realize the obvious implication of the reports in the bourgeois press that Stalin and his henchmen consciously worked to prevent revolution. Trotsky and his aides took special precautions in this connection. Had the Trotsky workers realized that Stalin and his crew betrayed the world proletariat in cold consciousness, Trotsky's charlatanry of "correcting" Stalin's hired assassins of revolution would have crashed to the ground. The anti-Stalin revolutionary workers would have seen Trotsky's story about the Thaelmanns and Fosters being misled revolutionists and his support to Stalin with "criticism" as a snare. To prevent the awakening of his victims Trotsky repeatedly stressed that the Stalinist burocracy was unconscious of its counter-revolutionary role. Just before Hitler assumed power Trotsky wrote in a vein of criticism: "The bureaucracy of the first Workers' State does everything decisive—*unconsciously,* but that is no excuse—to prevent the birth of a second Workers' State." (*Militant,* Nov. 12, 1932. Our emph.—G.S.)

After the rise of Hitler the Trotsky leadership continued harping on the "unconsciousness" of the Stalin burocracy: "The Stalinist bureaucracy, however, took the path of *unconscious* but nevertheless actual sabotage of the revolution." (*Militant,* May 20, 1933. Our emph.—G.S.)

On the one hand Trotsky was compelled to admit that Stalin's policy in framing the leaders and rank-and-filers of the Opposition was consciously conceived; on the other hand he assured the workers

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that insofar as the world proletariat was concerned, Stalin's intentions were honest. Trotsky kept reiterating this fraud almost to the end of his life. In a discussion with one of his supporters in April 1939 Trotsky asserted: "Stalin hoped that the German Communist Party would win a victory and to think that he had a 'plan' to allow Fascism to come into power is absurd." (*Fourth Int.* Jan. 1941, 25). Trotsky, of course, was cognizant of the fact that Stalin never opposed the Nazi development and by that alone promoted its expansion and facilitated Hitler's rise to power. At the hearings of the Dewey Commission Trotsky clearly indicated Stalin's precise attitude toward Hitler's movement: "You know, in the beginning of 1933 Stalin declared that 'we never opposed his movement.' That is referring to Hitler." (*The Case,* 293)

But Trotsky had to safeguard his whole political mythology built around the policy of "correcting" Stalin. The bourgeois press told a bit of extremely valuable truth about *Stalin fearing above everything else* a revolution in Germany. But Trotsky, even seven years later, knowing that Stalin never opposed the Nazi movement and even supported it, pictured Stalin as hoping "that the German Communist Party would win a victory" meaning that Stalin's attitude was to stop Hitler and thus release the proletarian flood in Germany.

CHAPTER XXIII.

TROTSKY'S LINE FOR AN "INDEPENDENT" INTERNATIONAL

1. *A Hesitant Turn*

THE IMPACT of the betrayal of the German proletariat by the Comintern and Social Democracy set off a wave of ferment in virtually every political organization within the working class. While the embittered Comintern workers manifested the usual gravitation toward Trotsky, inside the Trotsky organization itself an atmosphere of disappointment with Trotsky's policy of "reforming" the Stalin crew hung like a cloud. No one, to be sure, undertook the much-needed survey of Trotsky's political role, but the ideas of building a Fourth International received an extraordinary spurt.

For a while Trotsky made an effort to salvage his threadbare line, and for this purpose he resorted to ingenious tricks. The betrayal in Germany was so crass that Trotsky knew he had to write off the Stalin German section insofar as his followers were concerned. He therefore made an artificial separation between it and the rest of the Comintern in the same manner that he had divorced the Stalin leaders from the Parties they controlled. By this stratagem he sought to continue attaching his followers to the rest of the Comintern: "The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

change of our position towards the Party in Germany corresponds to the abrupt change which took place during the last events and which have completed the capitulation and the treason of the Party in Germany. It does not change our attitude and our position towards the Communist Party in the U.S.S.R. and the Communist International." (*International Bulletin* No. 12, April 19, 1933)

Thus Trotsky feigned that he had just now gained the insight into the treasonable role of the Comintern section in Germany, and he simulated lack of such discernment regarding Stalin's Russian burocratic machine, the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. He pretended not to know that the policy of betraying the German workers had been handed down from the Kremlin.

And while the burocrats of every other section of the Comintern worked feverishly to cover up the betrayal by approving Stalin's policy on Germany, Trotsky attempted to divorce these sections from the German and thus continued setting the old snare: "If other sections of the Comintern will learn the German lesson, they may rightfully deserve leniency of history. Otherwise they are doomed: In this way, the march of history gives to the other sections still some additional time to reconsider. We, the Left Opposition, are only the historic interpreters of the march of development. That is why we do not break with the Third International." (*Militant,* May 6, 1933)

Trotsky's political sycophants used all their wits to bolster the new version of his tottering line of "reforming" the Comintern. When the Stalinists arranged an "Anti-Fascist Congress" in Paris, a masquerade show to dupe the masses, the Trotsky leaders cooked up a declaration to the "Congress." They crammed the document with high-powered phrases damning Social Democracy, the Stalinist burocracy and Fascism, and ended by expressing readiness to shake the hand of the Stalin gang on the basis of working "for the rebirth" of the Comintern: "We, Bolsheviks-Leninists, propose to make the experience of the fall of German Communism a point of departure for the rebirth of all its remaining sections. We are ready to concentrate all our forces to that end. In the name of this task we extend our hand to our fiercest adversaries of yesterday." (*Militant,* May 20, 1933)

This buffoonery stirred rollicking mirth among Stalin's promoters of the "Congress" which met early in June 1933. When the Trotskyite delegates presented themselves their credentials were "expropriated" and they were denied admission. A few Trotskyites somehow got in; after a savage beating they were thrown out. ("The Paris Anti-Fascist Congress, An Anti-Trotskyite Slug Fest," *Militant*, July 1, 1933)

Brutal attacks upon the Trotsky followers, continual expulsion from the Comintern on charges of "Trotskyist counter-revolution," information seeping from Russia about the rising wave of arrests and fearful tortures inflicted upon the imprisoned former Trotskyites tended to make every crafty attempt of Trotsky and his aides to brace up

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his old line look utterly ridiculous. In the eyes of his honest followers the need for building a revolutionary International was becoming a matter of plain common sense. In addition to the changing sentiment within his own camp there was another, external source of annoyance to Trotsky. The revolutionary-inclined workers in the Left Social Democratic groups, some of which hovered between the Comintern and the Second International, felt that the German experience had supplied the decisive test for both Internationals. These workers were for dropping the role of playing critics to Social Democracy and to the Comintern and for the creation of an International opposed to both.

In the Summer of 1933 Left Socialist leaders of various organizations set up in Europe an "International Committee of the Independent Revolutionary Socialist Parties" and issued a call for a Conference, giving as the reason "The complete failure of the Second and Third Internationals and their affiliated parties to offer any effective opposition to the attacks of capitalism on the workers throughout the world." It was at this point that Trotsky made a complete about-face. Realizing that sooner or later he would have to abandon his frayed and faded policy, he decided that the moment was quite appropriate for introducing a seemingly changed line. The Left Socialist Conference would provide him with an opportunity to play the titan and win new supporters from Socialist groups to stabilize his own ranks.

The Conference convened on August 27, 1933 in Paris. It was a political hodge-podge. In addition to the Left Socialist parties of different shadings there were represented the Swedish Brandler-Lovestone group, the Urbahns Leninbund, a group of the Russian Left SRs and the Trotskyite Left Opposition. The last presented a declaration which on the surface was a complete change of Trotsky's line: "The orientation towards a new International is dictated by the whole course of development." (*Militant*, Sept. 23, 1933)

Three Left Socialist groups and the Trotskyites came to an agreement upon a brief document filled with generalities about Social Democracy being a "stinking corpse," about "the collapse of the Third International" and the need of "welding together of the proletarian vanguard into a new (Fourth) International." The document became known as the *Declaration of Four*. The Trotsky movement greeted the declaration with an enthusiastic outburst. To the rank-and-file the document was a declaration of political and organizational independence. They thought they would no longer have to be a "fraction of the official Stalinist Party."

2. *Trotsky's "We Never Promised"*

In the early months of the new line, Trotsky's Left critics pointed to the patent hollowness of his previous promises to "reform" Stalin's International. This evidently caused some annoyance to Trot-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sky. He replied: "We never promised anybody that we would *cure* the Comintern. We only refused, until the decisive test, to pronounce the sick as dead, or hopelessly ill." (*The Soviet Union and the Fourth International,* 9)

The befuddled members of the Trotsky organization repeated this reply in disputes with the Left critics. Had these members been more attentive in their reading of the Trotsky literature they would have recalled the following statement appearing in *The Militant* of October 21, 1933: "The slogan of the 'reform' of the Comintern was, for us, never a hollow phrase. We counted on reform as on a reality." Moreover, in his book *What Next?* Trotsky wrote positively: "The about-face of the Stalinists is inevitable." (182). And if the Trotsky workers had inspected Trotsky's work *The Strategy of the World Revolution* they would have come upon these words: "... the Opposition needs no other soil than that of the Communist International. No one will succeed in tearing us away from it. Our ideas will become its ideas and they will find their expression in the program of the Comintern." (86)

Hence, Trotsky's reply to the critics who permitted themselves the liberty of calling the workers' attention to Trotsky's promises of curing the Comintern was an evasion of truth.

3. *The Trotskyite "Independent" Line*

Having declared for a "complete break with the Stalinist Comintern and its American section," (*The Militant,* Sept. 30, 1933), the Trotsky movement in America acquired a new spirit. The Trotskyites —so the honest members believed—had broken with the Comintern burocracy forever: no more "correcting" the Fosters and Browders; no more political support to these putrid opportunists. With fighting resolution Cannon and Shachtman addressed meetings at which they assured their audiences that the Trotsky movement was now travelling an independent road. The Trotsky press took on a new aspect. On October 7, 1933 on the front page of *The Militant* there appeared in a heavily-bordered box an "Important Notice" which proudly announced: "With this issue *The Militant* begins to reflect the new course of the Communist League toward the building of a new party of Communism in America. Our aim is to transform *The Militant* from a propaganda organ ~~intended mainly for~~ Communists ~~into~~ a ~~popular agitation paper~~ appealing directly ~~to the mass of~~ American ~~workers.~~"

Three weeks later, on October 28, 1933 *The Militant* in a statement on New York elections carried the first popular appeal direct to the American workers on an "independent" line:

"Under the circumstances of our inability to put forward our own ticket in this election, the Communist League of America calls upon the workers of this city to cast their votes, at this time, *for the candidates of the official Communist Party* as a protest vote against

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the capitalist parties, not as an endorsement of blunders and crimes of the Stalinist leadership, of its policies." (Our emph.—G.S.)

Trotsky's "new course" in 1933 was of the same character as his "new course" back in 1923: it was his old Stalinist course!

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE STIFLING OF THE FRENCH PROLETARIAT

1. *The Comintern's Right Turn in France*

THE SUDDEN, unopposed, rise of Fascism in Germany gave an impetus to a mighty surge of Fascist tendencies in most capitalist countries. In France, due to the intensification of the economic crisis, the situation became volcanic. The workers in the trade unions, in the Stalinist and Socialist Parties, aroused to a fever pitch, demanded a showdown with reaction.

After they had delivered the German masses to Hitler on the ultra-Leftist line, Stalin and his cohorts knew that to continue this line much longer would bring a widespread rebellion in the Comintern. They had to make a turn to the Right, towards a bloc with Social Democracy on the 1923 pattern.

Having worked up a fanatical hatred of Social Democracy as a variety of Fascism, the Comintern burocrats had to step warily in making the about face. The workers of both the Comintern and of Social Democracy had to be spoonfed with the belief that Social Democracy had learned the terrible lessons of Italy and Germany and was discarding its counter-revolutionary politics.

Discerning the unmistakable symptoms of a developing revolutionary situation in France, Stalin and his burocrats hastened the unfolding of their Rightist policy in that country. About June 1934 the French Stalinists were ordered to shelve the characterization of Social Democracy as Fascism and to extend the hand of collaboration to the Socialist Party of France.

The leaders of the French Socialist Party (S.F.I.O.) despised and detested Stalin's Thorezes whose cries of "Social Fascism" and incitements to lynchings they had endured for many years. But the swelling surge for united action among the Socialist workers was reaching the flood stage. In such circumstances to reject the Comintern's hand would have meant losing followers to Stalin and to various Left groups standing outside both the S.F.I.O. and the Stalin party, and would have given a greater impetus to the idea of forming a new International.

2. *Trotsky Clears the Path for Stalin's Right Turn*

Having himself participated in the engineering of Rightist and Leftist turns, Trotsky knew that the ultra-Left line, which had its

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

starting point in China in August 1927, had become untenable. Familiar with the inner workings of the Kremlin he always anticipated Stalin in the change to a new line. Thus, when the Rightist game with the Kuomintang had worn thin Trotsky cleared the path for the ultra-Left zigzag by attacks on the "Rights" and by such declarations as "That is why it would be incorrect to deny the *possibility* of the present zigzag developing in a direction of a consistent proletarian course." (*Third Int. After Lenin,* 292) As we have seen, Trotsky kept alive this bubble of "possibility" for the entire five-year period of the ultra-Left zigzag. With the bursting of the bubble together with the ultra-Left zigzag, Trotsky knew that Stalin had no other course but back to ultra-Rightism and therefore to a renewal of cooperation with Social Democracy. Realizing that the Comintern faced a tremendous difficulty in changing from the tactic of branding Social Democracy a variety of Fascism to the tactic of collaboration with it, Trotsky commenced working to remove the difficulty. This could be done on the basis of presenting Social Democracy as becoming capable of operating in the interest of the workers. Thus, while the Comintern still maintained the vestiges of ultra-Leftist attacks on Social Democracy, *The Militant* of July 29, 1933 published what purported to be a letter from Brussels signed "Lesoil." Over the letter was placed an extremely significant caption: "For a Social Democratic Government in Belgium—Why?" Even more outspoken was the following in the letter: "A Social democratic government coming to power by the struggle of the masses against the bourgeois coalition would be obliged, under the danger of complete discreditment, to carry out a policy of defense of the interests of the workers."

The letter appeared to be incidental in character. For some time after its publication the Trotsky line of denouncing Social Democracy as an enemy of the workers seemed unchanged. The "Declaration of Four," printed several weeks after "Lesoil's" letter, stated in unrestrained terms that "The Social-democracy once more confirmed the designation given it by Rosa Luxemburg and revealed itself for the second time as 'the stinking corpse.' "

Watching the situation with a practical eye, Trotsky awaited the Rightist developments. When in the middle of 1934 the French Section of the Comintern and the Socialist Party of France agreed upon a united front, Trotsky realized at once that he had to generate hopeful illusions about this Stalinist-Socialist tactic. Therefore, while Stalin's heralds trumpeted joyously about the new understanding with the S.F.I.O., Trotsky's lieutenants made their rank and file members feel depressed because they were excluded from the united front. The next move was a letter sent by Trotsky's International Secretariat to all his sections broaching the idea of getting the French Trotsky group into the united front through the Socialist door: "Comrade G (Trotsky), along with others, thinks the time has come for the French organization to take its place in one of the camps of the United

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Front, working for probable organic unity. The Stalinist camp being closed, the only way open is that of entry into the S.F.I.O. (Socialist Party of France)."

Trotsky supplemented the organizational directive with "theoretical" motivations. He now closely linked the fate of the proletariat with Social Democracy, presenting a newly-concocted "theory" that the destiny of the workers hinged upon the transformation of Social Democracy into an anti-bourgeois force fighting Fascism. (*New Int.* Sept.-Oct. 1934, 70)

Having contrived a historically progressive possibility for the stinking corpse, Trotsky "attacked" the French Stalin Party, declaring that "the Stalinists are retarding the revolutionary development of the Socialist Party."

3. *Rebellion Against the "French Turn"*

Trotsky's line of sending his French group into the Socialist Party came as a shocking surprise to the whole rank-and-file of his organization. For a moment the bulk of the membership thought that Trotsky, hard pressed by the Stalinist and bourgeois persecution, had suffered a collapse. The false position advanced in the new thesis was too obvious to be easily concealed by a smoke-screen of theoretical phrases. Only yesterday the Trotsky workers had read in *What Next?* "The Socialist democracy must be destroyed. The Communist Party must be corrected." Now it began to look as though Trotsky had set out on a new wild-goose chase, this time to "correct" Social Democracy.

Despite repeated assurances that the move was designed only as a local tactic to be carried out exclusively in France, many Trotsky workers felt that the turn would have a wider application. During their one year of "independence," as a new international movement, they had in actuality played the role of a tail to the Comintern. And now they would be buried inside Social Democracy. How it was possible for Social Democracy to have changed its character was inconceivable to these workers. They did not realize, of course, that the change had occurred not in the nature of the S.F.I.O. but only in Trotsky's tactics.

Although the first reaction of the bulk of the rank and file was negative, the high Trotsky leaders, almost to a man, immediately rendered their chief enthusiastic support and affirmed their unshakable faith in the French Turn. However, a few of the lesser leaders in the Trotsky organization placed themselves at the head of the rebellion.

A terrific struggle ensued. Equipped with the old documentary ammunition from Lenin's and Trotsky's fight against Social Democracy and drawing upon statements made only yesterday by the high leaders themselves, the rebels opened a barrage against Trotsky and his yesmen. On their part, the high leaders had only Trotsky's authority to pit against their opponents whom they immediately dubbed

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"The Lunatic Fringe," making up in vehemence what they lacked in scientific arguments.

4. *The French Trotskyites Under the S.F.I.O.*

The French Trotsky group stayed in the S.F.I.O. about a year. During the first phase of their sojourn the Trotsky leaders hailed every Left-sounding phrase of the Socialist demagogues as signifying a change in the revolutionary direction. This tactic, naturally, aided the Socialist leadership to rehabilitate itself in the eyes of both the Socialist and the Comintern workers. But as the policies of the Stalin-S.F.I.O. united front grew crudely Rightist, the Trotsky leaders, to save face, were forced to change their tactic and begin to criticise the policies of the S.F.I.O. This became a source of annoyance to the Socialist leaders who clearly perceived that the Trotsky group had completely outlived its usefulness in their organization.

The first action against the Trotskyites was taken at the French Socialist Youth Congress on July 28, 1935. Through the simple but cogent argument that people who advocated building a Fourth International had no place in the Second, a motion was passed to expel the Trotsky youth. The Socialist burocracy supplemented its organizational act by administering a frightful beating to the young Trotsky followers. A few weeks later the main body of the Trotskyites was booted out of the S.F.I.O. Reforming their ranks, the Trotskyites launched an organization of their own, with a policy of urging the Stalinist and Social burocrats to the revolutionary path.

Meanwhile the politico-economic situation grew more tense. Strike struggles increased in numbers. Workers seized shops and factories and clashed with the Fascists and Government forces. Swinging further to the Right the Stalin burocrats broadened the united front to include the bourgeois Radical Socialists and formed a "Front Populaire." In the May 1936 elections the Front Populaire was swept into power, with the leader of the S.F.I.O., Leon Blum, installed as the first Socialist Premier of France. A show of dissolving Fascist organizations followed and was accompanied with a policy of pacifying the workers who threatened the bourgeoisie with the seizure of its entire industry. In the process of stabilizing the situation, the Popular Front Government paid the Trotskyites the usual reward for their services to Stalin and Social Democracy. They were attacked in the streets by the Socialist and the Stalin supporters, the Trotsky paper *La Lutte Ouvriere* was seized by the police and its editors were arrested and charged with "Conspiring against the State."

After a year of noisy meetings, parades, and demagogy, the Popular Front successfully demoralized the workers and gave way to a conservative bourgeois-democratic regime. With Trotsky's timely and extremely effective aid the Comintern and Social Democracy had liquidated another revolutionary situation.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XXV.

TROTSKY'S FRENCH TURN IN AMERICA

1. *Unity with Muste*

ONCE INTRODUCED, the Comintern's swing to the Right steadily gained momentum and unfolded internationally. Accordingly, Trotsky soon dropped the pretense that the French Turn policy would be confined to France alone and sent his other groups one by one into the Second International, but not without internal struggle and further splits.

In America circumstances put off the entry of the Trotsky group into the Socialist Party to a late date. There was a considerable interlude during which the American Trotsky group merged with the American Workers Party, originally The Conference of Progressive Labor Action (C.P.L.A.).

The American Workers Party reflected the reactionary petty-bourgeois dream of divorcing the American working class from the problems of the world proletariat. While this organization contained many honest workers, its leadership was a conglomeration of frustrated opportunists from various political camps. "Put another way, the membership of the A.W.P. included everything from proletarian revolutionists to reactionary scoundrels and fakers." (Cannon, *Hist. Am. Tr.* 171). The organization was headed by an ex-reverend A. J. Muste. The American Trotsky leaders were fully familiar with the history and the role of Muste and the various other self-styled progressives. "Every single one of them, from Muste to Howat, has played the contemptible role of decoy for the reactionaries." (Cannon, *Militant,* April 1, 1931).

A flirtation with the Musteites was started by Cannon and Shachtman early in 1934, and in December of that year the marriage was consummated on a horse trade basis. Muste accepted the political system of the Trotskyite deception. In return he was given the post of National Secretary of the new Trotskyist Workers Party. Cannon and Shachtman disregarded completely the man's record and their own diagnosis of Muste's "contemptible role of decoy for the reactionaries." They now pampered Muste, repainted his whole political career and cynically played up to his egoism. A few weeks after their fusion with Muste they tendered him a testimonial dinner: "On Wednesday, January 9, a testimonial dinner will be given for A. J. Muste, National Secretary of the Workers Party, at Irving Plaza, New York City. The dinner is to commemorate his fiftieth birthday and the fifteenth year of his *invaluable service* in the revolutionary labor movement." *(New Militant,* Dec. 29, 1934. Our emph.—G.S.)

The honeymoon soon gave place to a bitter domestic quarrel. It did not take Muste long to awaken to the disappointing fact that he had been cheated in the deal. He was made a mere figurehead, a political orderly of the clever Trotsky leaders.

In a setting made complicated by the noisome fight of the anti-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

French Turn forces and the perennial multi-factional burocratic intrigues and quarrels the Trotsky organization simmered for nearly a year-and-a-half. And while the factional turbulence ran its course, Cannon and Shachtman kept an eye on the Socialist Party.

2. *Trotskyites' Short Stay in the American Socialist Party*

The favorable moment arrived in May 1936. The factional struggle which had been raging in the Socialist Party between the Left and the extreme Right "Old Guard" over the adoption of Left phraseology and the line of rapprochement with the Comintern, culminated in a withdrawal of the Old Guard. Seizing upon its departure as a basis for a claim that the Socialist Party was now cleansed, the Trotsky leaders announced their decision to enter this organization: "Joining the Socialist Party as we are, with our ideas and traditions, we urge all revolutionary workers to do likewise and to add their energies to the efforts of the many thousands of Socialist workers in a common struggle to build a powerful party of revolutionary Socialism." (*New Militant,* June 6, 1936)

But when did the startling transformation of the American Socialist Party begin if it could now be built into "a powerful party of revolutionary Socialism"? The turn, said the Trotsky leaders, had actually come several years previous: "The Detroit convention of the Socialist Party in 1934 marked a decisive turning point in the history of the movement. The Declaration of Principles then adopted, despite the ambiguity and confusion of its formulations, made a sharp break with the classical reformism of the post-war Social-Democracy and gave evidence of a determination not to repeat the terrible mistakes and crimes of the parties which had led the Austrian and German masses to the yoke of Fascism." ("Workers Party Calls All Revolutionary Workers to Join the Socialist Party," *New Militant,* June 6, 1936)

Records, however, again thoroughly expose the Trotsky leaders. Before the French Turn they themselves had freely exposed the essence of the Detroit Declaration of Principles. Cannon wrote: "This is the role of Centrism. The revolutionary impulses of the workers are met with general formulations which sound extremely radical but which do not mean anything specifically. The Detroit declaration abounds in these treacherous and deceptive formulations. It is a classic document of Centrism." (*Militant,* June 9, 1934). Even *after* Trotsky had launched the French Turn, Cannon wrote: "Our rivals—the C.P. and S.P. are irremediably bankrupt." (Nov. 17, 1934)

But a year and a half later, to facilitate their maneuvering into the American section of the international "stinking corpse" Cannon and Shachtman pretended to view the Socialist Party as a sound potentially revolutionary force and misinterpreted the formulations of the Detroit Declaration as meaning that the American Socialists were

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

determined not to follow in the footsteps of the German and Austrian Social Democracy.

The Trotskyites stayed in Norman Thomas' Socialist Party about fourteen months. During this period they naturally maintained the closest connection with Trotsky.

However the stay in the Socialist Party was becoming uncomfortable. Thomas' politics went so far to the Right as to line up the organization, just as Browder did the Communist Party, and as the "Old Guard" Socialists their Labor Party, behind La Guardia, the bourgeois mayor of New York. When Cannon and Shachtman had first entered the Socialist Party they were able to dose the Trotskyist rank-and-file with synthetic revolutionism and induce them to drum up votes for Thomas for president in 1936. But it was altogether out of the question to urge the Trotskyite workers to help re-elect La Guardia.

The La Guardia issue brought matters to a head. Thomas and his allies engineered an expulsion campaign, and again the Trotskyites became organizationally "independent," and once more by compulsion. Raising some demagogic noise about "revolution" and "Socialism" the Trotsky leaders in December 1937 named their group "The Socialist Workers Party."

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE BETRAYAL OF THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION IN SPAIN; STALINIST LEFTIST LINE—1931 - 1934

1. *The Leadership of the Proletariat*

THOUGH predominantly an agricultural country, Spain had undergone considerable economic development during the decades of capitalist imperialism, notably in the days of the war of 1914-1918. Correspondingly, the Spanish proletariat had grown in numbers and militancy.

The oldest form of proletarian movement in Spain was Anarchism. It organized the most militant workers in the Iberian Anarchist Federation (FAI) and in the Anarcho-syndicalist trade unions, the National Confederation of Labor (CNT). Priding themselves upon being "Anti-authoritarians" the Anarchists set their minds against "politics," against *all* States, thus rejecting the postulate that the proletariat must establish its own State to lead the masses to Socialism. The main srength of FAI and CNT lay in Barcelona, capital of Catalonia, the most industrialized section of Spain.

Spanish Social Democracy based itself on the Socialist trade unions (UGT), numerically larger than the CNT but far less militant. The seat of Social Democracy was Madrid.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

When the movement for the Third International swept the capitalist countries, it met little response among the "anti-political" Anarcho-Syndicalists, but registered a certain success among the Socialist workers. In 1918 a small Left section broke away from the Socialist Party, and in April 1921, after the Socialist Convention rejected a resolution to join the Comintern, a larger portion split off and formed the Spanish section of the Third International. Numerically, the Spanish Communist Party was insignificant, and the ceaseless burocratic centralization drove many of its leaders and rank-and-filers out of the organization. After the expulsion of the Trotsky tendency led by Nin and of the supporters of the Brandler-Lovestone tendency headed by Maurin, the Communist Party by 1930, about a year before the opening of the period of Revolution, was reduced to a mere office force of a few dozen functionaries carrying on purely clerical work. The virtual none-existence of a Comintern section in Spain was presented by the Trotskyites as an extremely regrettable fact: "Can even *one hundred* dues payments be counted in the Spanish party? No! Here is the true, the sad and chaotic reality. The C.P.S. is in a dying state and it lacks the most indispensable aid." ("Letter from Bilbao," *Militant*, Jan. 18, 1930)

While inspiring its followers with the task of building up the Spanish section of the Comintern, the Spanish Trotsky group itself enjoyed a period of remarkable expansion. The Trotsky leaders wrote enthusiastically: "Our most sensational success has been in Spain. The Spanish Opposition has been transformed from a number of isolated groups living in enforced exile in France, Belgium and Luxemburg, into a powerful factor in the Spanish movement. Following the fall of Primo de Rivera, it was able to win over—in an amazingly brief period—the most decisive sections of the official Party and regroup those workers who had left it. The strongest Party districts are already with us, and the work has only been started." (*Militant*, May 3, 1930). That this description was no empty boast can be seen from the later admission of the Comintern burocrats themselves: "The followers of Leon Trotsky, led by Andres Nin, were long more influential than the Communists, as were the 'Right opposition' group led by Joaquin Maurin." (Gannes and Repard, *Spain in Revolt*, 214)

2. *The Fall of the Monarchy; Proletarian Revolution on the Agenda of History*

The Spanish bourgeoisie had for years aspired to a direct control of the State. Though fearing the masses, the bourgeoisie counted upon bringing the workers and large peasant population under its full sway after removing the monarchy. Events showed, however, that the bourgeoisie completely underestimated the anti-capitalist explosive force within the working class and the peasantry.

On April 12, 1931, following a period of political excitement, the bourgeoisie won a sweeping victory in the municipal elections. The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

triumph was secured because the Anarcho-Syndicalists discarded their anti-voting doctrine for the occasion and went to the polls as the shock troops of the bourgeois candidates. On the 14 of April the newly-elected municipal councils of the principal cities proclaimed the Republican regime. The King fled.

Assuming authority the bourgeoisie set up a Provisional Government with Alcala Zamora as the head of the Cabinet, Manuel Azana as War Minister, and Largo Caballero as Minister of Labor. The first, founder of the bourgeois Republican Right, only a year previously had been a professed Monarchist. Azana was a noted jurist and writer, leader of the bourgeois party, Republican Action. Largo Caballero was an outstanding leader of the Spanish Socialists of a Left tinge. Piloted by these three men the Provisional Government took over the entire administrative and repressive apparatus of the ousted Monarchy. Many Royalists and other reactionary elements, hoping for an early establishment of a conservative and reasonably stable bourgeois regime, declared for the Republic. Even the generals, Fascists and Monarchists almost to a man, though accustomed to excercise political power under the King, supported the Provisional Government. Acting on the understanding that nothing basic would change in Spain and her colonies, the eminent military figure, General Sanjurjo, turned against the Monarchy. As commander of the Civil Guard, which was a powerful military arm of the State, he was given the post of "Protector of the Republic." General Francisco Franco, the future Fascist dictator, also lent his support to the Liberal-Socialist Provisional Government. In return he was retained by Azana on the general staff, and later was appointed as head of the General Military College of the Republic. King Alfonso's police and State burocracy became Republican overnight, joining in the great pageant of jubilation.

Before the Republic was four weeks old the Spanish workers clashed with it in their demands to curb the Monarchists.

In the first skirmish between the bourgeois Republic and the workers, in May-June 1931, the Socialist Minister of Labor, Caballero, fully cooperated with his bourgeois colleagues. "The Socialists themselves opened fire upon the strikers." reported *The Militant* of July 25, 1931. The short record of the Liberal-Socialist government was already darker than the long record of the recent military dictatorship. "The republic government has assassinated more workers than did Primo de Rivera in the seven years of his government." (*Militant,* Sept. 5, 1931)

While many alarmed bourgeois political leaders and generals, shaken in their thoughts, made a turn toward devising a Fascist mechanism to maintain capitalism in Spain, the heads of the Provisional Government continued with the experiment in "democracy."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3. *Trotsky Aids Stalin to Build the Spanish Communist Party*

Unless Stalin made a dramatic bid for leadership, he and his entire apparatus of the Comintern would have faced the danger of falling under suspicion of abandoning the Spanish masses to the Anarchist and Social Democratic leaders. The strange aloofness of the Comintern would have been self-condemnatory in the eyes of its rank-and-file. It was necessity, therefore, that prompted Stalin to build a powerful Communist Party in Spain.

The Republic was set up at the time the Comintern ultra-Left zigzag was approaching its wildest stage. The tiny handful of Stalin's recruiting clerks in Spain with the few workers who followed them were at once convulsed with "revolutionary" hysterics. Writing later in a vein of self-criticism, one of the leaders of the Comintern recalled some of the Leftist antics: "The Communist Party in Spain had only a few hundred members at the time when the Spanish republic was proclaimed in April, 1931. Its influence in the trade unions was insignificant. In many cities incorrect tactics were employed by the Party organization and by individual Communists. When the masses came out on the streets to celebrate the proclamation of the republic, the Communists shouted 'Down with the republic,' just as did the monarchists." (O. Piatnitsky, *The World Economic Crisis,* 63)

The Stalinists translated their delirious ultra-Leftist slogans into fierce action. Running amuck in Barcelona, Madrid and elsewhere they struck with frenzy at the police, fired at the Anarchists who had helped usher in the Republic, and assaulted every "social fascist" they met. (*Comm. Int.* July 1, 1931, 327)

The masses recoiled from the "Communists," yet a few weeks later the most militant workers got their first taste of Republican brutality and, cursing the Republic, turned an inquisitive eye toward the Stalin Party.

During the political crisis early in 1931 the Trotskyites in Spain strained every effort to build the Stalin section. Their report a few weeks before the fall of the Monarchy had stated: "The Spanish Communist party hardly exists. At the present moment, it has neither unity, nor cadres, nor clear perspectives. The first task of the Communists in Spain is to invest their party with organization and a political platform. This work had hardly been begun. Let us add that it cannot be conducted properly except through the tenacious efforts of the Opposition." (*Militant,* March 15, 1931)

Aided effectively by the Trotsky group, which, though a larger body, assumed the modest role of being but a fraction of the Spanish Communist Party, the latter within a short time registered a marked success. Four months after the fall of the Monarchy the Trotskyites were able to report: "The membership of the Spanish Communist Party has grown considerably in the past two months." (*Militant,* August 22, 1931)

But if the influence of Stalin's Party was growing, so was that of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Trotsky group. "Today the Communist Left Opposition is the organization toward which the most conscious proletariat of Spain turns its eyes." (*Militant,* April 16, 1932). Those advanced workers who had perceived that the Comintern was opportunist moved in Trotsky's direction. Trotsky's name was pronounced with great respect by many workers. His books were in great demand, particularly in industrial Catalonia—"there is not a newstand on the Rablas, not a bookstore in all Barcelona without a dozen books and pamphlets by Comrade Trotsky" (*Militant,* May 15, 1931)

One of the prescripts which every adherent to the Trotsky group had to accept was to use his energies and influence on propagating the idea that the proletariat must be led by no other body than the Spanish section of Stalin's political machine. This line had been launched by the Trotsky leadership over a year before the fall of the Monarchy. "The Spanish Communist Party must be the guide of the working class of Spain, its vanguard." (*Militant,* February 15, 1930)

Trotsky never assigned the leading role in the large betrayals of the workers to his own sections, even though a specific Trotsky group might be larger than Stalin's, as in Spain. Trotsky's iron rule, which he maintained to the last day of his life, was: Let Stalin lead, and the Trotskyites would tail along, camouflaging their policy with "criticism." In accord with this rule Trotsky sent prodding letters to his Spanish followers. Addressing the leader of his section in Spain, Trotsky wrote: "It has always appeared to me that many comrades have underestimated the possibility of the development of the official Communist Party in Spain. I have written you about this more than once. To ignore the official party as a fictitious quantity, to turn our back to it, seems to me to be a great mistake. On the contrary with regard the official party we must stick to the path of uniting the ranks." (*Militant,* Nov. 14, 1931)

Trotsky's efforts in aiding Stalin to develop the Spanish section of the Comintern were being crowned with success. Though Stalin's influence was still limited, his flunkies everywhere boasted of the great strides his Spanish section was making. The Trotsky leaders, viewing the progress of the Stalin party with a sober eye, deplored the exaggerated accounts of the Comintern burocrats. Wrote Max Shachtman: "Then we learn that 'the workers of Spain are turning in masses to the revolutionary leadership of the Communist party' (D. W. 1-23-32). *Unfortunately* (Our emph.—G.S.), this big mouthful is miles distant from the truth, if only for the reason that these same journalist-manufacturers and their Spanish colleagues have done everything they could to keep the masses from the Communist party." (*Militant,* January 30, 1932)

The growth of the Spanish Communist Party was too slow to suit the Trotsky leaders. And for the lag they blamed the Stalin burocrats, because they themselves had been doing everything they could to lure the masses into the Stalin trap.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Reaction On The Offensive*

The smoldering fires of the class struggle burst into flames again and again with strikes, butcheries of the workers, burning of churches and growing alarm among the bourgeoisie. In Andalusia in the Spring of 1932 the peasants, having futilely awaited agrarian reforms for a whole year, proceeded to expropriate the big estates. Warned by the lessons of the French and Russian Revolutions many rich landlords fled abroad.

Confronted by a perpetual crisis, the Zamora-Azana-Caballero Government intensified its efforts to quell the masses. Its repression fell most heavily upon the militant workers: the Anarchist, Stalinist, Trotskyist and Socialist. The Socialist workers had been losing patience with the Government and joining the strike struggles. Unable any longer to hold them in leash, many Socialist leaders placed themselves at their head in order not to lose the confidence of the Socialist masses.

The extreme Rightist bourgeois elements, in a combative mood, made plans to restore the Monarchy and institute a reign of terror against the masses. On August 10, 1932, the "protector of the Republic," General Sanjurjo, misjudging the degree of revolutionary energy and spirit of the workers, led an attempt to seize power in Seville, while his accomplices in Madrid tried to capture the War Office. The workers burst forth in a violent explosion. Sanjurjo was seized by the workers and naively turned over to the Republican Government to be tried for high treason. Like Kerensky in the case of General Kornilov, Azana had to conduct a mock trial. Sanjurjo was condemned to death; but Azana reprieved him. Whether the Liberal Azana was implicated in the military plot, as the Social-Revolutionary Kerensky in the Kornilov affair, is difficult to ascertain from the available documentary records. The Trotsky press asserted that "Not only was the Azana government not ignorant of plans for a military coup d'etat but underhandedly tolerated them." (*Militant,* Sept. 3, 1932). A curious circumstance was the queer behavior of the Republican officials during the Sanjurjo rebellion. "The Sevillian authorities, for example, surrendered their power to the monarchists without offering the least show of resistance." (*Militant,* Oct. 1, 1932)

The tempestuous action of the workers went on for sometime. Royalist newspaper offices were wrecked, Monarchist clubs razed, prisons broken into and their inmates, Stalinists, Anarchists and others released. To allay the workers' resentment the Government resorted to liberal gestures. It ostensibly suppressed the Monarchist press, which soon was reestablished; it passed a bill expropriating all lands owned by the nobility (Sept. 9, 1932) but made no serious move to carry this decision into practice. The big landlords owned 57 per cent of the land in Spain. By the end of 1933, over a year after the agrarian Reform Bill was passed, the Zamora-Azana-Caballero Government had expropriated a measly one sixth of one percent of this land.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

How the Government acted in practice toward the peasants who took the paper reform at face value was demonstrated by its brutality in Casas Viejas. When the peasants of that valley, starving on their pitiful holdings, attempted to till the lands of a local nobleman, the Government force, with the cry "Fire at the bellies" and "Take no prisoners," wreaked a bloody punishment upon them (January 11, 1933). The village was shelled, an Anarchist family was burned in its house, the peasants were pursued into the fields and shot down like rabbits.

The massacre of Casas Viejas, directed by Azana, caused an outraged cry throughout Spain. Curiously, the loudest clamor came not from the workers and peasants but from Royalist and Catholic groups. The leaders of the extreme Right knew the value of demagogy. Their papers were aflame with hatred for the Republic. The Monarchists sent representatives to investigate the Casas Viejas butchery, demanded a commission of inquiry, the punishment of Captain Rojas who had commanded the punitive expedition, and attempted to force Azana's resignation. However, Azana's political neck was saved by the Socialist deputies of the Cortes who gave him a vote of confidence.

Strikes and local risings continued unabated. The Anarchist workers now detested the Republic with intense violence, the Socialist workers were bewildered and embittered, most of them suspicious of their own leaders. The vast peasant masses were gloomily disappointed, discouraged and antagonistic. Meantime the Monarchists, drawing confidence from the confusion and dissentions within the Zamora-Azana-Caballero bloc, clustered round the Fascist leader Gil Robles and his organization C.E.D.A. (Confederacion Espanola de Dereches Autonomas), and steadily gained strength. Emboldened, the Fascists grew quite outspoken in their aims and indicated that capitalist democracy was but a bridge toward the achievement of Fascism. "Democracy" wrote Gil Robles in *El Debate* in October 1933 "is for us not an end, but a means to go on to the conquest of a new State."

In a splurge of demagogy the bourgeois Right introduced a bill to free all political prisoners. It promised relief to the two million unemployed and assured the virtually landless peasantry that when in power the Right would divide the lands of the nobles—a policy which the Left coalition of the Liberals and Socialists would not carry out.

In the November 1933 elections the political tide swept to the Right. Most Anarchist workers, having tasted the bitter fruit of capitalist democracy, and having observed the establishment of Fascism in Germany in January 1933 through parliamentary manipulation of the "democratic" constitution, heeded their leaders and stayed away from the polls. Many Socialist workers, incensed by the treachery of their own leaders, gave their vote to the Stalin Party. The large mass of the peasantry was cool toward the elections. Some voted for the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Left; others switched to the clerical-Fascists, accepting their demagogy for true coin.

Because of its continuous denunciation of the Liberal-Socialist regime, the Stalin Party was approaching a gigantic stature as compared with the stunted dwarf it had been three years previously. Despite the internal dissatisfaction with the developments in Germany, it now boasted a membership of over 20,000, far outstripping the Trotskyites. The growing strength of the Stalin Party was shown by over a quarter million votes in the 1933 elections, the only Left party registering gains at the polls.

The bourgeois Right secured a sweeping electoral victory and formed a government under Alejandro Lerroux, but, biding its time, it did not venture to include in the new Cabinet either Robles or any other avowed Fascist. As a reaction to the Rightist parliamentary victory, a wave of strikes and violent Leftist outbursts rolled over Catalonia and other parts of Spain. Some of those turbulent strikes and minor insurrections were led by the Anarchists and Stalinists; at the head of a good many of them stood the Socialists; a number of the blind uprisings of the workers were conducted by the Trotskyites.

CHAPTER XXVII

SPAIN: STALINIST RIGHTIST LINE—1934-1939

1. *The Stalin-Trotsky-Socialist-Syndicalist Workers Alliances*

WHEN Stalin and Trotsky undertook to restore the Spanish Communist Party, the Comintern Left line was in full swing; after the line became untenable upon the delivery of the German vanguard to Hitler, the two Russian burocrats, divided by mutual personal hatred but united in political aim, switched to Rightist methods in building the Comintern trap in Spain.

Disturbing developments in Europe, coupled with the all-too-visible signs of expanding Fascist activities in Spain itself, roused the entire Spanish proletariat. The disaster which had overwhelmed the German masses, the audacious conduct of the French Fascists, the shocking news of the bloody victory of the Austrian Fascists over the Socialist workers of Vienna (February 1934), aroused in the masses resentment against the Socialist policies which closely followed the policies of the representatives of German and Austrian Social Democracy in the bourgeois Cabinets. Feeling that he might be shed as the leader of the Leftward swinging Socialist masses, Largo Caballero emulated his prototypes abroad. He proceeded to peddle the deception orginated by Trotsky that Fascism had succeeded in Germany because of disunity of the German working class and that a united front between the Comintern and Social Democracy could serve as an obstacle to Fascism. Like Blum in France and Left Socialists in other

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

countries, Largo Caballero and his coadjutors, while issuing promissory notes to establish a Socialist Republic, deflected the revolutionary sentiment of their followers into the channel of cooperation with the Stalin burocrats.

Governed by the new policy, the Spanish Socialist Party in June 1934 invited the Stalin burocrats to participate in the funeral of its member, Juanita Rico, assassinated by the Fascists. The Stalin Party sent its followers to take their place in the huge Socialist procession. On September 13, 1934, after amicable negotiations with the Socialist leaders, the Stalin burocrats made their own followers as well as the Socialist, Trotskyist and other workers feel happy by entering the Workers Alliances.

Agitation for the formation of Workers Alliances had been carried on long before by Maurin, an expelled leader of the Communist Party, and by the Trotskyites whose keynote was a general united front. The agitation struck a responsive cord among the Socialist and a section of the Anarchist workers. While the official CNT-FAI turned a deaf ear to the project, and while the Stalin burocrats at first branded the idea of Workers Alliances as counter-revolutionary, a number of Socialist burocrats acceded to the persistent clamor of their discontented followers and agreed to the formation of these bodies.

By October 1934, a crucial moment in the Spanish Revolution, the Workers Alliances were an omnibus of the most dangerous internal foes of the proletariat brought under one roof. In the driver's seat, as could be expected, were the Stalin burocrats. The others were the Socialists, Trotskyists, Maurinists, representatives of a Peasant Group which was outspokenly against Socialism, and Pestanists, whose leader and tendency received a fairly accurate description in the Trotsky press: "Angel Pestana, ex-syndicalist leader who recently passed over into the Left republican camp with his ill-starred syndicalist Party." (*Militant,* Oct. 20, 1934) The program of the Workers Alliances at first flush appears to be a crude compromise by all the constituents. A closer view shows the domination of the Rightist Stalinist policy. The Trotskyist ideological cover for the Workers Alliances, this omnibus of treachery guided by the Stalinists, was to paint it as the "proletarian united front." (Felix Morrow, *The Civil War in Spain,* 32)

2. *An Ideal Setting for a Betrayal*

In the face of a mounting wave of anti-fascist protests and because the bourgeoisie had to move by degrees, the Lerroux Government made a pretense of quelling the Fascists but at the same time actually carried out repressions against the workers.

To allay the alarm among the workers the Stalin and Socialist burocrats noisily threatened action against the Government should it attempt to institute the Fascist form of rule. Accordingly, when in October 1934 the bourgeoisie, venturing to accelerate the pace, inducted Gil Robles and two members of his gang into the Cabinet, the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Stalin and Socialist burocrats through the Workers Alliances launched a "revolution."

Viewed from every possible angle the October 1934 affair represented no danger to the Spanish bourgeoisie. The numerous disruptive features which crowded the Spanish political scene in October 1934 could not have been but plain to the strategists of the uprising. Over a million workers of the CNT and FAI rejected any association with the Workers Alliances. Many of these workers, located in the important industrial centers and on the railroads, viewed everything that savored of Marxism with undisguised hostility. Caballero, Stalin, and Trotsky could safely rely upon these workers not to stay the Government's hand in suppressing the uprising. The peasantry at that time could hardly be expected to join a sudden insurrection. It was now largely under the influence of the Rightist CEDA. The Army as a whole could be depended on by the bourgeoisie to do its job of suppression; the Navy showed no signs of mutiny. Thus the combination of circumstances was ideal for maneuvering a section of the proletariat into a major massacre.

3. *The Betrayal*

A search into the events of October 1934 reveals that the strategy of the Stalinists was to carry out a Leftist putsch through a Rightist policy of a united front with the Social Democratic leaders, Anarchists, Trotskyites and Spanish Lovestoneites (Maurin). The specific victim was the workers of Asturias, an industrial and important mining section of Northwestern Spain. As to the rest of the country, matters were arranged politically in such a fashion that the Stalin and Socialist workers would in no way tie the hands of the Government in its task of crushing the uprising in Asturias.

The Asturian workers were well supplied with arms and with large quantities of dynamite secured by the miners. The Workers Alliances and the Socialist UGT issued a strike call and the Asturian workers were thrown into furious battle against Government troops. Oviedo, the capital of Asturias, was captured by the workers, and the burocrats proclaimed the "Workers' and Peasants' Republic of Asturias." Under their guidance factories producing war material were taken over and distribution of land among Asturian peasants was put into effect. The Socialist and Stalinist burocrats set themselves up as the rulers and provided for the registration of all workers eligible for military service.

Caballero, who directed the workers in Madrid, later asserted that his idea was not to establish a proletarian State but to scare the capitalists into giving up the plans of resorting to Fascism. To maintain his influence with the Socialist workers, Caballero concealed his own conscious policy of restraining them, but he was more outspoken about the deliberate sabotage by some of his colleagues: "He later revealed that the Socialist leaders, such as Andreas Sabout, consciously

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sabotaged the plans for the uprising and had withheld instructions for the revolt until it was too late." (Gannes and Repard, *Spain in Revolt,* 152). The police were notified of where the workers had stored arms. "There is considerable evidence that the information leading to these discoveries came from Socialist leaders themselves." wrote a Trotskyite from Oviedo. (*New Int.* Dec. 1934, 151)

While the Government was suppressing the Asturian workers, Catalonian workers were ingeniously held in leash by the Stalinist and Socialist leadership of the Workers Alliances. The petty-bourgeoisie of Catalonia, aspiring to national independence, feared that with the growth of centralized power in Madrid they would be deprived even of their limited semi-autonomy. In consequence they pressed the Companys-Denkas Left bourgeois regime of Catalonia to strive for a separate Catalan State. Seizing upon this situation the Stalin and Socialist burocrats, while conducting an uprising in Asturias ostensibly for the establishment of a Soviet Spain, tied the Catalan Workers Alliance to the bourgeois "independence" movement guided by the Companys regime. Later, in a vein of self-criticism, the Stalin historians admitted: "The Workers' Alliance, instead of taking the lead for the independence of Catalonia on the basis of the revolutionary struggles of the working class, waited for the Catalonian bourgeoisie to act under the leadership of Louis Companys." (Gannes, *Soviets in Spain,* 14). The Trotskyites wrote: "In Catalonia, which should have been the fortress of the uprising, dependence on the petty-bourgeois government of Companys proved fatal; more fearful of arming the workers than of capitulating to Gil Robles, Companys broadcast reassuring statements until, surrounded by Madrid troops, he abjectly surrendered." (Morrow, *C.W. in S.* 32)

Everything worked out as could have easily been foreseen, and no doubt *was* foreseen, by Stalin and Trotsky. The Anarchists outside Asturias not only refused to join the strike but used the Government radio in Barcelona to urge the workers to ignore the strike call. The CNT railroad workers transported the Government troops to Asturias. That the Comintern was the chief betrayer in the Asturian massacre is an easily verifiable fact. Stalinist slogans stirred the imagination of the advanced workers. It was the Stalinists who provided popular excitement by defying every capitalist tradition. They aroused astonishment and admiration by their boldness in plastering police stations and Government buildings with notices "Form Soviets!" and the doorways of churches with the quotation from Marx, "Religion is the Opium of the People." The enterprising Stalinists had stamped their slogans on the Madrid Government coins "Death to Hitler," "Long Live Russia!" In the so-called "Workers' and Peasants' Republic of Asturias" their ideological penetration was complete. The Workers Alliances under Stalinist political guidance invested every move with the traditional symbols of the October Revolution and Civil War in Russia. The armed force was named "Red Army," the Asturian cur-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

rency was stamped with the hammer and sickle, the press poured out stirring Stalinist propaganda, the workers adopted the Stalinist salutation of the clenched fist.

A few days after the Asturian "republic" was crushed, the Stalinist burocrats said: "The workers of Asturias fought for Soviet Power under the leadership of the Communists." (*Comm. Int.* Nov. 5, 1934). When the conglomorate ruling "Revolutionary Committee" set up its radio in Oviedo, one of its first messages was to the Stalin Central Committee in Madrid: "All of this region is in our hands."

4. *The Trotsky Participation in the Crime*

Trotsky had but just introduced his French Turn when the Asturian betrayal was perpetrated. Although the Spanish Trotsky workers distrusted the Socialists, for almost a year the Trotsky leaders had been collaborating with the Socialist burocrats in the Workers Alliances. The Trotsky leaders labored to break down the healthy aversion on the part of their followers toward the Socialist Party. Trotsky's theoretical basis for the French Turn, that the destiny of the proletariat hinged upon the transformation of Social Democracy into a revolutionary force, aided the Trotsky leaders in Spain to achieve their end. The Trotsky leaders devised the fraud that the Socialist Party had adopted the position of the overthrow of the Spanish bourgeoisie: "The Socialist party, in an attempt to rectify its past, has pushed its more conservative leaders to the background and forged ahead under a new banner—that of the Proletarian dictatorship." (*Militant*, Oct. 6, 1934)

A year before the adoption of the French Turn Trotsky was tying the anti-Stalin and anti-Socialist revolutionary workers to the Russian burocracy under the smokescreen of "correcting" the Comintern. Now Trotsky accomplished the same purpose by attaching them to the Stalin-Socialist united front under the smokescreen of "correcting" the Socialist Party. In an article "Armed Clashes in Spain as Civil War Begins" the Cannon-Shachtman leadership told the workers: "Meanwhile it will be the duty of all workers and all working class organizations to give their wholehearted support in action, to the efforts of the Socialist Party, while not failing at the same time to point out its political and tactical errors, in an effort to correct them." (*Ib.*)

Since the dread of Fascism was uppermost in the mind of the workers, the Trotsky leaders, seemingly basing their theoretical conclusions upon an analysis of the debacles in Germany and Austria, assured the workers that by combining the Stalinists, Social Democrats, Anarchists, Lovestoneites and themselves into one united front, Fascism could be defeated: "Only a united front of all working class tendencies can defeat fascism and clear the way for proletarian insurrection in Spain." (*Ib.*) The deception which this thesis concealed was that *all* the tendencies operating within the Spanish proletariat

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
ACCEPT-

were opportunist and counter-revolutionary, and that a united front with the Stalinists in it would function on no other but the *Stalinist line.*

Suspending for the time being its ferocious hounding of the Trotskyites, the Stalin Party, with the approval of the Socialists, actually invited their Trotskyist cousins to share the power in Asturias. The testimony of the Comintern burocrats themselves confirms this fact: "All the workers' parties and organizations were called to the central headquarters of the government to participate in the administration of the Commune and to arrange for the defense of the workers' and peasants' republic." (Gannes, *Soviets in Spain,* 19)

But the Stalin burocrats were careful not to widen their collaboration with the Trotskyites on a national scale, for such a move would have rendered ineffectual the old bogey of "Trotskyism." Without giving any explanation, the Trotsky leaders recorded this limitation of the Stalin-Trotsky collaboration to Asturias: "This is the only province where every single force in the labor movement participated in the united front." (*Militant,* Oct. 13, 1934).

Ordinarily the Trotsky leadership would tie its followers to Stalin under the guise of "disagreements" on policy. But in the Asturian unity the Trotsky leaders dropped the mask of "disagreements" and gave unqualified support to Stalin's line: "In Asturias, the Workers Alliances have been functioning for a year. Supplied from the arms smuggled in by the steamer Turquesa, all the workers' organizations succeeded in arming themselves. Thence the splendid results obtained in the first forty-eight hours. In addition, there were *no disagreements* in the objectives pursued by the organizations, in view of the fact that there existed the Alliances, instruments of the insurrection in Asturias, which oriented, defined and led the movement." (*New Int.* Nov. 1934. Our emph.—G.S.)

The policies of Trotsky, of Social Democracy, of the Spanish Lovestoneites (Maurin) and of Stalin were so identical in the October 1934 events that the leadership of the Socialist Youth, in its appeal for an "International that has broken with the errors of the past," called upon the Stalin, Trotsky and Maurin youth to merge with the Socialist youth. It argued: "The Socialist Youth of Spain feel the unpostponable need of achieving the organic unity of the revolutionary proletarian youth which has already been united in struggle. During the October revolution we have struggled together against fascism in a single block and for a common purpose. Why should this not continue to be so? Why continue separately if our line is the same?" (*New Militant,* Jan. 12, 1935). The leaders of the Spanish Socialist Youth probably did not grasp that during "Spain's October" they themselves had followed the Stalin line. A little over a year later the Socialist Youth merged with the Stalin youth and affiliated to the Comintern.

That the Trotsky leaders collaborated with Stalin and Caballero

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

to bring on a carnage of the Asturian workers is an open-and-shut case. Trotsky and his erudite henchmen were fully aware of the counter-revolutionary nature of the organizations with which they were working. There was no chance for the victims to disentangle themselves from the net into which they were enticed by the joint efforts of Stalin, the Socialists and Trotsky.

5. *The Spirit of the Spanish Masses*

For a while savage repression prevailed throughout Spain. In "defense of the democratic Republic," the Ministry of Justice made it seem that its persecution extended even to such irreproachable bourgeois leaders as Azana. Despite the constitutional provision of immunity for the members of the Cortes he was put in prison, but was soon released.

As against the background of cruel punishment inflicted upon the workers, the treatment of the leaders who had instigated the affair was mild. Not one of them was executed. Largo Caballero was let off with a year of confinement. Another Socialist leader, Prieto, departed for Paris, and when the reactionary rage subsided, although the jails and prison-ships were still filled with workers, he returned to resume his seat in the Cortes.

The state of affairs within the Spanish working class after the October 1934 ordeal, was, however, disappointing to Stalin and Trotsky. Their goal was far from being achieved. While the "Hamburg putsch" had brought the revolutionary situation in Germany in 1923 to a conclusion, and the "Canton Commune" had marked the final phase of the 1925-27 Chinese Revolution, the massacre of the "Asturian Soviet" did not dampen the spirit of the Spanish proletariat. The proletariat sensed that the defeat was neither general nor decisive. Awakened by a feeling of remorse for not having supported the Asturias, alarmed by the widespread repressions and the growth of Fascist danger, the mass of the Anarchist workers realized that they had been betrayed by their leaders. Admiring Stalin's "fighting organization of the Spanish proletariat" which more than all the others had displayed incredible courage and made great sacrifices, they turned toward the Stalin Party and also to the Socialists. At secret meetings in Catalonia, Andalusia, Aragon, Castille, Leon and elsewhere, sections of the CNT passed the decision to join the Alliances and pledged support to the Socialist and the Stalin candidates in the next elections.

May 1, 1935 witnessed a demonstration of the rising morale and strength of the workers. The impression that the bourgeois Right had consolidated and made secure the power of the capitalists and landlords was shattered by a general strike which paralyzed all industry.

Everywhere, in the shops and factories, the workers talked of hardly anything else except the need of establishing a "Soviet Spain."

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
ACCEPT-

6. *The Ultra-Right Line of the Seventh Congress*

In talking of "Soviet Spain" the Spanish masses reflected the ideological remnants of Stalin's Leftist line which had been virtually discarded by the Comintern. The Rightist turn, begun in 1933 after the German betrayal, was slowly unfolding. Commanding increasing influence among the Spanish masses, the Stalin burocrats began to introduce the slogan of unity with Left bourgeois elements in a supposed struggle against Fascism. The official launching of this new phase of the Rightist line took place at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern in July 1935 in Moscow where the Stalin henchmen laid down a thesis for the formation of Popular or People's Fronts in political collaboration with the Liberal bourgeoisie. The objective was, supposedly, the maintenance of bourgeois democracy against the threat of Fascism. In bygone years the Stalin burocracy had mouthed at least half correct phrases about the role of bourgeois democracy in the face of the mounting Fascist danger. Even after Hitler took power and began eliminating bourgeois democracy in Germany, the Stalin burocrats wrote: "The defense of bourgeois democracy is advanced for the purpose of maintaining the capitalist dictatorship as against the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (*The Communist,* April 1933). Now at the Seventh Congress the illusion was introduced that the basic struggle in capitalist society was not between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat but between bourgeois democracy and Fascism: "Now the toiling masses of capitalist countries are faced with the necessity of making a *definite* choice and of making it today, not between proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois democracy, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism."

The implication of the "Bourgeois democracy versus Fascism" thesis was that in order to save themselves from Fascism the workers had to rely upon the Left bourgeoisie which, purportedly, fought for the preservation of capitalist-democratic institutions under *all* conditions. This was a policy close paralleling the "lesser evil" tactic of the German Social Democrats which invariably brought the victory of the "greater evil"—Fascism.

Before the rise of Hitler the Stalin burocrats, day after day, year in and year out, had repeated the postulate: "Fascism organically grows out of bourgeois democracy." (*Inprecor,* June 10, 1931). This proposition was demonstrably true. A leading theoretician of the Comintern declared prior to the Right turn: "Only a bourgeois liberal can construe a counter-distinction between present-day bourgeois democracy and a Fascist regime." (D. Z. Manuilsky, Report to the Eleventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, April 1931). The very thesis advanced at the Seventh Congress had been decisively rejected in 1933: "The XI Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International has swept aside the artificially constructed counter-distinction between bourgeois democracy

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
_ACCEPT-

and Fascist dictatorship." ("The Nature of Fascist Dictatorship" *Kommunistische Internationale,* Jan. 19, 1933)

Now the Stalin henchmen reversed themselves and assured the workers that by supporting bourgeois democracy, the very form of capitalist rule which had brought Mussolini and Hitler into power, the masses would escape Fascism! No wonder the most outspoken Rightist elements within the working class voiced approval of the thesis issued in Moscow. The extreme Right Wing Socialist organ, the Jewish *Forward* of New York, enthusiastically subscribed to the new thesis: "A correct word comes from Moscow at last, an open-hearted declaration that in many countries there cannot now be any talk of Communism any longer, that there is no such a thing there, and that there are in these countries only two issues, Democracy and Fascism. We sign this declaration with both hands."

The Spanish workers, who subjectively fought to end Capitalism and establish Socialism, never suspected that the seemingly purely theoretical formula introduced by Moscow and universally acclaimed by the Socialist and Liberal enemies of the proletariat, would be soon applied in Spain to seal the doom of the Revolution.

7. *The "POUM"*

An organization which played a vital role in the fundamentally Stalinist betrayal of the Spanish Revolution was The Workers Party of Marxist Unification (POUM). It was basically composed of dissident Trotskyites who had broken with Trotsky on the issue of the French Turn in Spain. Trotsky had ordered his Spanish section to enter the Socialist Party of Spain, but the leaders of his Spanish section, Nin and Andrade, with the full support of the membership, flatly refused to comply with the order. Trotsky raged, admonished, threatened, expostulated—in vain.

The leaders of the Trotsky organization in Spain had every reason to preserve its separate existence. The Spanish section was the largest in the Trotsky International. It was a prosperous concern, growing due to the revolutionary tumult. In Catalonia the Trotskyite organization assumed such large proportions as to exceed in size and influence the Stalin and the Socialist Parties. No acute intellect was required to see that by their entry into the Socialist Party the Spanish Trotsky leaders would lose most of their members. The Spanish Trotsky workers only a short while back, during the October 1934 events, had witnessed the treachery of Caballero and the Socialist Party at close range. Most of these advanced workers would have refused to join the "stinking corpse." Nin and the other leaders of the Spanish Trotsky movement had functioned as Trotsky's loyal henchmen for many years. Never, at any time, had these leaders embarrassed him with such dangerous questions as had Treint. Their line was not to pry back across many years into the actual doings at the Twelfth Congress, the Lenin Levy, the Testament, Trotsky's vile horse-deal with Zinoviev, and many other

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
ACCEPT-

unsavory occurrences in Trotsky's history. They had fully accepted Trotsky's word for everything and had operated under his tutelage. In common with the leaders of other Trotsky sections they had been teaching the workers that Stalin's bootlickers, the Thaelmanns, Thorezes, Browders and Diazes were honest but misled revolutionists. They had urged the German workers to pin their hopes on the Stalin Party, they concealed Trotskyist support to the Hitler-Stalin referendum in Prussia and disseminated the ideological opium contained in Trotsky's *Germany: What Next?* and other works.

Having set out on their own organizationally, but loaded down with Trotsky's theoretical baggage, Nin and his colleagues surveyed the political field and soon became engaged in unity negotiations with the Workers and Peasants Bloc headed by Joaquin Maurin. On September 29, 1935 representatives of both organizations gathered in a unity Congress in Barcelona and brought into being an unusual political organism, a hybrid of Trotskyism and Lovestoneism. Its program was neatly filled with revolutionary phrases against Fascism, for the power of the proletariat, for a Soviet republic—abstract cliches such as had cluttered the literature of the Comintern and of Trotsky and to a degree of the Left Social Democrats. The POUM's evaluation of the Comintern closely followed Trotsky's. In its attitude toward the Stalinists and Socialists the POUM, before it was set upon physically, was very friendly. It looked upon them as "Our Stalinist and Socialist Comrades." (*Spanish Revolution,* Dec. 23, 1936). Breeding Trotskyist illusions, the leaders of the POUM to the last kept up a protective fog about its parent body: "We look upon Trotskyism as being simply a sectarian tendency of revolutionary Marxism." (*Spanish Revolution,* May 19, 1937). An important branch of the Stalinist political system, the POUM soon after its formation revealed its true politics by giving "critical" support to the Stalinist counter-revolution.

8 *The "People's Front" Government*

Toward the end of 1935 Spain vibrated with a tumultuous uproar against the Right bourgeois administration. Immense mass meetings, at times comprised of a quarter of a million participants, were held. Behind these colossal gatherings stood the Stalin Party which had established Communist-Socialist contact committees all over the country and was making overtures to the Liberal bourgeoisie. The Workers Alliances were jettisoned. Instead there was being forged a "broad united front against Fascism." The huge rallies were addressed not only by renowned leaders of the Stalin and the Socialist organizations, but also by Azana supporters, by followers of Companys and by other capitalist politicians. Fascism was denounced and demands were raised for amnesty for the tens of thousands of political prisoners and for immediate general elections.

To the inflammable tinder was now added the threatening mood of the peasantry whose patience was reaching exhaustion. Daily, hour-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ly, history was leading up to a gigantic flare up of the entire toiling population of Spain. Reluctant as the bourgeoisie was, it had to continue with the parliamentary show, meanwhile making preparations behind the scenes for a Fascist coup. In response to the popular clamor, on January 8, 1936 the Cortes was dissolved and new elections were fixed for February 16. Stalin's political flunkeys submitted a proposition to Azana and other Republican watchdogs of Capitalism. The Republicans were invited to participate in a Popular Front election bloc based on a common program. The proposition was accepted with alacrity. Stalin brought the theoretical formula of the Seventh Congress to a practical concretization. Knowing that in times of revolution a Left bourgeois regime is but a cover for a Fascist plot, Stalin was manipulating to restore Azana to power.

At this point it is apropos to note that while Stalin's Party was becoming the factual leader of the Spanish proletariat and of the peasantry, and could by means of a 1917 line have overthrown the Spanish bourgeoisie, Stalin could not have risked the move. True, his personal power was now highly centralized; yet due to geographical remoteness of Spain from his territorial boundaries and because of the high level of militancy of the Spanish workers on the one hand and the danger of a break away of his Spanish stooges once they independently assumed power, on the other, the only policy that was safe for him was a policy of extinguishing the Revolution in Spain.

On January 16, 1936 the Popular Front program was presented to the masses. The Stalin and Socialist leaders faced many resentful working class audiences and had to explain away what many workers perceived to be a rotten platform. Admitting that Azana was an enemy of the workers the Stalin gang argued that he nevertheless was opposed to Fascism, and it was a good revolutionary tactic to use him temporarily and then establish a Soviet republic. "The temper of the masses is indicated by the fact that during the election campaign Largo Caballero had to assure his audiences that the coalition with the bourgeoisie was merely a 'tactical expedient' and that the election would be merely a stepping stone to a Soviet Spain." (*New Militant,* Feb. 22, 1936)

The POUM's leadership blinked at its own solemn declaration of political independence and knocked on the door of the Stalin-Socialist-Liberal bloc. This act proved that the Spanish Trotsky leaders had objected to the French Turn in Spain not on principled political but on organizational grounds. They had no objection to giving political support to Social Democracy. The Stalin guides of the Popular Front and their Socialist and Liberal partners put up no obstacles to the admission of the semi-Trotskyist POUM.

Backing the Stalin policy to the hilt, almost the entire proletariat of Spain, including a large number of Anarcho-Syndicalists, rallied behind Azana, the standard-bearer of the Popular Front.

The Popular Front was victorious in the election contest. Upon

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the initiative of the Stalin burocrats, the Republicans were alloted the majority of the seats won by the coaltion. President Zamora called upon Azana to form a Cabinet. For the valuable service rendered in supporting the Popular Front, the POUM was given a seat in the Cortes.

During the election campaign the Stalin and the Socialist burocrats and Azana had assured the workers that once the Popular Front came to power it would launch a relentless struggle against Fascism. But after it was installed in office, the Popular Front did not curb the activities of the Fascists. Even before the echoes of the Stalinist-Socialist-Republican promise to suppress Fascism had died away, the Fascists unleashed a terrorist wave not only against the workers and their opportunist leaders but even against bourgeois Liberals.

Despite the Fascist terror the workers were not at all overawed. They replied to the Fascist violence with violence and with strikes.

On May 10, 1936 the Cortes elected Azana President of the Spanish Republic. Though he was the choice of the People's Front, the bourgeois Center and even the Right fully appreciated his political intentions and refrained from putting up an opposing candidate. Elected by the votes of the Stalinists, Socialists, Liberals and Fascists, Azana was inducted as the second president of the Republic amid the thunderous singing of the *Internationale* by the Stalinist and Socialist People's Front deputies.

Azana took over and maintained the entire repressive State machinery which had operated under King Alfonso and the first two Republican regimes. "And the question of the Army: almost every officer is either a fascist or (more often) a monarchist." (*Inprecor*, July 4, 1936, 831). Even the Foreign Legion, that band of professional murderers of the workers, was kept in full readiness for action. Azana had had dealings with the Fascist military previously as war minister. It had been he, who, looking ahead, had rejected the demands to dismiss General Franco. "After the Monarchy collapsed, some of the Spanish Republicans wanted Franco cashiered. Manuel Azana, then Minister of War, refused. 'Franco is above all a soldier,' he said. 'We can count on his integrity.'" (*N.Y.T.* Magazine, Nov. 8, 1936). General Franco used the post in which Azana had retained him to build a Fascist machine by recruiting professional strikebreakers and out-and-out Fascists. When the People's Front took over, Azana made a move for appearances' sake and "exiled" Franco to the Canaries as Military Governor of the Islands. There, safe from the workers' observation, Franco could rapidly organize the military action against the Spanish masses. Meanwhile his Fascist cadres in Spain were neither "banished" nor disbanded.

9. *The Last Preparations of the Fascists*

In March 1936, a few weeks after the advent of the Popular Front Government, General Sanjurjo arrived in Berlin to consult with the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Nazis on the plans for Fascist action in Spain. This may have been a secret to the Spanish workers, but the Soviet Union burocrats did not deem it necessary to hide it (*Pravda*, March 12, 1936). The Spanish Popular Front Government representatives in Germany furnished Sanjurjo the required cooperation. "Working with General Sanjurjo in Berlin were the Spanish ambassador Francisco Agramonte of Cortijo, an aristocrat, and lieutenant Col. Manuel Martinez, military attache." (Harry Gannes, *Spain Defends Democracy*, 9)

The mounting terror, the widespread evidence of the Fascist preparations glaringly demonstrated to the workers that a military outbreak was due at any moment. Almost every church was becoming a Fascist arsenal (Reports of the Deans of Chichester and Rochester). Fascist newspapers were openly collecting funds for the forthcoming enterprise. Under the shielding wing of the People's Front regime, Hitler established in Spain a Nazi force disguised as a trading firm. Franco's collaborator, General Goded, Commandant of the Balearic Islands, organized a Fascist camp on Majorca, with a large influx of Italian Fascists and Nazis. The camp was a dagger pointed at the workers of Catalonia.

Meanwhile, the Fascist brigands had made certain alterations in their tactics. Instead of opposing they now fomented strikes, provoked as much chaos and disorder as possible and even secretly joined the crowds firing churches. Some Fascists were seized and upon being searched documents were found definitely instructing them in that policy.

As the tension was moving toward the breaking point, an energetic and articulate vanguard of the workers demanded immediate action of their political guides who had engineered the supposedly anti-Fascist People's Front. To save face, the Stalin leaders were forced to release a stream of "criticism" against Azana. "The Communist Party sharply criticized President Azana and Prime Minister Casares Quiroga for the government's dangerously slow response to the mounting evidence of the oncoming coup. It was pointed out that fascist officers in the army, members of the Falange Espanola, and the C.E.D.A., who were dismissed from their posts in the peninsula, were sent to Morocco, at higher pay." (Gannes, *Spain in Revolt*, 100)

The Comintern printed a series entitled "Secrets of Spain" pointing to widespread preparations of the Fascists and the "paralysis" of the "anti-fascist" People's Front Government. On the other hand, a Stalinist member of the Cortes, Dolores Ibarruri, stated in June 1936: "neither the attacks of reaction, nor the more or less masked maneuvers of the enemies of democracy, will succeed in breaking or weakening the confidence which the workers have in the People's Front and the Government representing it." And the official Stalin organ in Spain, while admitting a thing or two about the People's Front Government, declared: "However, we consider that anything tending to break the ranks of the popular masses, to discredit the Government

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in their eyes, is suicidal." (*Mundo Obrero,* June 17, 1936). And so, the Spanish Stalinist leadership recorded the vigorous Fascist moves foreshadowing a coup and also the alarm of the masses and their amazement at the strange attitude of the People's Front Government. "People everywhere are anxiously asking themselves: what is the government waiting for?" (*Inprecor,* July 4, 1936). The head of the Stalin Party wrote a few weeks after Franco opened the Fascist military action: "Then came the putsch of July 18 which surprised no one." (Joseph Diaz, *Le Populaire,* Sept. 8, 1936)

10. *The Miracle of the Workers*

In their July 17-18, 1936 military outburst, the Fascists were dogged by many unforeseen setbacks and mishaps. At the very outset of the uprising, their chief leader, General Sanjurjo, died in a plane crash. General Franco flew to Morocco to take over the direction of the enterprise. Detailed plans and important documents had been destroyed in Sanjurjo's crash, and that was a blow to the Fascists. Next, a number of officers in Spain, even generals, hesitated to join the rebellion. Only a small part of the Navy and Air Force followed Franco. This caused great dismay in his camp for it spelled difficulty in ferrying the Foreign Legion from Africa to Spain. Since part of the Army was not in favor of a Fascist regime, Franco had to resort to a colossal lie that he was acting to protect the Republic from a Moorish uprising. (*Manchester Guardian,* August 12, 1936). Many soldiers actually rebelled against Franco. (Borkenau, *The Spanish Cockpit,* 69)

When Franco took over the control of Morocco, on July 17, 1936, and radioed to the garrisons in Spain to join him, the Government, having received his communication, kept the news concealed from the masess. And at that supremely crucial turn every hour of concealment counted heavily in favor of Franco. Next day of course the whole world was stirred by the news of the Fascist uprising. Then the People's Front Government pursued the tactic of denying that any generals on the Spanish Peninsula had joined Franco: "The Government declares that the movement is exclusively limited to certain cities of the Protectorate Zone (Morocco) and that nobody, absolutely nobody on the Peninsula, has added to such an absurd undertaking." At that very time Franco's companions, Generals Mola and Cabanellas had already struck in Saragossa and Burgos, while General Queipo de Llano had surprised the workers at Seville.

Franco moved from Morocco to the Peninsula on the morning of July 18. It was of the utmost importance to him that the Spanish masses were kept in ignorance of his moves, at least in the beginning, and to have them believe that he had nothing to do with the Fascist rising. The People's Front Government obliged him: "The government categorically repudiated rumors that troops had crossed the straits from Morocco and landed at Algeciras or that General Fran-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cisco Franco, military Governor of the Canary Islands, had joined the rebellion." (*N.Y.T.* July 19, 1936). Upon the signal from Franco, the Commander in the Balearic Islands carried out a military uprising following which a strong Fascist force sailed for Barcelona. To aid the Fascists in their aim to surprise the workers in Catalonia, the Government branded the news of the rising as untrue: "Rumors of a military uprising in the Balearic Islands were also officially refuted." (*Ib.*)

When the workers found themselves face to face with the rising of the Fascists in the cities, the Government sought to aid the Fascists by a different method. It assured the workers that its own "measures" would be adequate to suppress the rising. "These measures, together with the customary orders to the forces in Morocco who are laboring to overcome the rising, permit us to affirm that the action of the Government will be sufficient to reestablish normality." This entrapping promise was approvingly published by the Stalin and the Socialist leaders on July 18, 1936. But their followers, impelled by a healthy instinct, completely disregarded all authority and went over the head of the Government and their own leaders. That the Government's promise was a treacherous ruse is quite clear since its troops and Civil Guard took no part in suppressing the Fascists: "The key to an understanding of events in Spain is the fact that, in the four great cities of Madrid, Barcelona, Valencia and Malaga, where the rebellion was suppressed, the suppression was accomplished not by government troops or by the Civil Guards, but by armed workers." (*N.Y.T.* Sept. 17, 1936)

Having trapped the masses with the People's Front, the Stalinists, Azana and all the other conscious enemies of the proletariat, no doubt hopefully looked forward to a Fascist seizure of power at one stroke. But for once all the enemies of the Spanish proletariat miscalculated. The workers were not servile tools of Stalin like Jose Diaz or Dolores Ibarruri, nor were they loyal to Spanish capitalism like Caballero. When on July 17, 1936 the generals opened their drive, the workers' hatred for Fascism took fire like tinder. There was virtually no pause to wait for the "anti-Fascist" People's Front Government to act. The workers smashed the disciplinary shackles with which the Stalin and Socialist leaders had chained them to Azana.

While the Fascists had been arming themselves to the teeth, Azana had seen to it that the workers remained virtually unarmed. This was no longer a secret: "He is known to have been strongly opposed to the arming of the populace." (*N.Y.T.* Sept. 26, 1936). But lack of arms did not stop the workers. With staves, stones, kitchen knives and other primitive weapons they stormed Government supply depots, secured arms and surged forward against the Fascist garrisons. Utterly ignorant of the art of war, but fired with fanatical courage, the workers, countering the entire policy of the "democratic" Government, carried out the suppressions of the Fascists on a heroic scale. Of all the numerous conflicts of civilians against a regular army that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

had ever been chronicled, the fight of the Spanish proletariat against the well-equipped veteran troops of General Franco was probably the most fierce. Wrote *The New York Times* of July 25, 1936, one week after the Fascists had launched their attack: "The proletarian militia fought a battle that history will record as one of the most severe ever contested by a civilian army against trained military forces."

Although the capitalist ideologists termed the situation as a Fascist insurrection against a democratic Government, they recognized that the struggle was between the workers and Fascism: "...the rebellion in Spain developed into a bloody struggle between fascism and the Marxist proletariat." (*Ib.* July 22, 1936)

The situation in Madrid at the outbreak of the Fascist war was somewhat unique. Apparently Franco's "democratic" confederates were aware of the fact that the garrison's sympathies were not with Fascism. Therefore the Azana Government confined the troops to their barracks. This prevented the soldiers from interfering with "Fifth Column" activities within the city when General Mola some weeks later converged his four columns of Fascist troops upon Madrid: "Madrid troops remained in their barracks, confined there by order of the government. To a great extent this suited the plans of the conspirators..." (*Ib.*)

The Fascist Fifth Column staged an uprising in the city, using churches and other buildings as forts. But the workers, almost barehanded, made short shrift of Mola's Fifth Columnists.

It is abundantly evident that had not the class-conscious workers for a moment broken sharply from the People's Front, and consequently from the Stalin-Socialist control, a Fascist regime would have been established in Spain in less than a week.

With all calculations upset, the Stalin-Socialist-Liberal bloc was caught between the policy of facilitating the Fascist enterprise and the need of keeping up the appearance of fighting it. The Stalinists immediately proceeded to reforge the disciplinary chains which the workers had broken. The major difficulty was that "On July 18, 1936, the whole state apparatus was destroyed and state power lay in the streets." (Dolores Ibarruri, May 1938). The dissolution of the official People's Front Government was a move to clear the stage for the establishment of the Fascist regime. President Azana, expecting the Fascists to take over immediately, withdrew to a monastery. Prime Minister Quiroga simply vanished and was announced to have "resigned."

In utter confusion, the handful of deputies, officials and a few remaining members of the Cabinet "elected" Barrio, another respectable Republican, in Quiroga's place. Barrio, completely bewildered, tactically blundered by inviting Franco's aides, Generals Mola and Cabanellas, to enter the People's Front Government. Naturally the Fascist generals did not acquiesce in such stupidity. The palpably idiotic move inflamed the workers who probably would have lynched

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Barrio had not the Stalin and Socialist burocrats succeeded in taking hold of the anti-Barrio demonstration. Barrio promptly resigned.

On the afternoon of July 19, 1936 the National Committees of the Stalin and Socialist parties made a desperate effort to harness the workers to the empty shell called the Government. "The Government commands and the People's Front obeys." they said. But the Government in the first days of the Franco uprising did not even issue an order for the arrest of the five leading generals of the Fascist forces, Franco, Goded, Quepo de Llano, Mola and Cabanellas.

As on the first day of the February 1917 Revolution in Russia, the Spanish workers on July 18, 1936 were physically beyond the control of their internal and class enemies. They were masters of the territories where they had crushed the Fascist monster. This flare-up of the Spanish workers went far beyond anything the Russian masses had attempted prior to the October Revolution. With the Catalonian masses in the vanguard, occupation of shops and factories, hotels, palaces of the Grandees and of their estates and land began on a wholesale scale. Spontaneous workers' committees in industrial establishments, patrols to search the houses of known Fascists, proletarian courts—all sprang up like mushrooms. Done with crushing the Fascist risings in the centers, the workers' militias, swelling in numbers, swiftly advanced into the territories where the Fascists had succeeded in capturing isolated points.

The Stalin and Socialist burocrats were like a driver with a runaway team of horses. Although the ideological reins were in their hands, they were helpeless, compelled for a few brief days to ride along.

11. *The Miracle of Stalin*

Just as the Kuomintang Government in the period of the Chinese Revolution, the People's Front Government, in a nightmare of anxiety, had no alternative other than to lean upon the Comintern, the only force capable of effectively bridling the proletariat.

Following the resignation of Barrio a Cabinet was formed by Jose Giral. Azana, realizing that in his post he could effectively aid the Fascists, resumed the Presidency. Cognizant of the moving spirit behind the gigantic anti-Fascist tide which was sweeping Catalonia and the industrial centers of Spain, the Stalin-Socialist-Azana crew understood that the new setting required a new tactic in carrying out the old policy. The work of the political assassins of the Revolution now fell into several new and distinct patterns. Whereas previously Azana had screened the Fascist military preparations behind a cloud of anti-Fascist words and an occasional arrest, now the Azana Government could restore its authority only by an outward demonstration of its earnestness in the attempt to suppress the Fascist rising. Civil Guards and the part of the Army that had not gone over to Franco were sent to the front alongside of the workers' militias. Several

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cities were at once taken over from the Fascists: Toledo, San Sebastian, Albacete, Carthagena, La Linea and other towns, while Seville, Cadiz and Cordoba were besieged.

The manipulation was highly effective. In one week the Spanish masses fell victim to the illusion that capitalist democracy was, at bottom, really an enemy of Fascism. The half-buried shade of the Azana Government suddenly took on a solid substance and rose to unprecedented heights of prestige. Forgetting its former sabotage, workers turned trustingly toward "their" Government and without misgiving followed the Stalin-Socialist motto: "The Government commands and the People's Front obeys."

With a statesmanlike grasp of the occasion, the Azana Government adopted supplementary physchological strategy behind the front. It ordered confiscation of all church property (July 28, 1936) and appointed a committee "to control all industries." The Catalan government of Companys decreed seizure of the Ford and General Motors plants and other enterprises, including banks, transport, and utilities. This bourgeois "seizure" was made for the *protection* of capitalist property against the danger of seizure by the workers, but to the masses it was pictured as a sweeping drive for Socialization.

To continue reoccupying the towns captured by Franco would have caused the whole Fascist affair to collapse and would have defeated the intrinsic purpose of the People's Front. The authentic policy of Azana-Giral soon began to show itself. What at the beginning was generally advertised as a broad offensive against the Fascist army was soon revealed as no offensive at all. Subsequently the Stalin burocrats were compelled to admit that—"By the sixth week of the fighting, the Giral Cabinet had not yet gone over to the offensive which alone could have assured victory for the Republic." (Gannes and Repard, *Spain in Revolt,* 149)

While simulating a fight against Fascism, the People's Front Government actually aided Franco in various ways. One of them was to restrain the workers' militias and Government troops from capturing the Fascist strongholds: "Only a desire to avoid further bloodshed, the loyalist regime asserted, has stayed its hand in the attacks against Granada, Saragossa, Cordoba and Seville. They could be captured any day' a government statement contended." (*N.Y.T.* Aug. 6, 1936)

While the workers were held in leash, Franco was sweeping on toward the city of Badajos to form a junction with the northern Fascist army led by General Mola. The People's Front Premier Giral minimized the danger to Badajos by saying: "The situation is extremely satisfactory, and within forty-eight hours the end may be in sight!" (*Ib.* Aug. 12, 1936). Indeed, the situation was *extremely satisfactory* for Franco, and within forty-eight hours his forces entered Badajos and commenced the appalling slaughter of the workers. The People's Front officials suppressed the news, but it leaked out, rousing

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the workers who by now had also learned of a similar massacre in Algeciras.

While the Fascists were advancing from their centers, the People's Front Government was assuring the workers that the Fascist forces were in retreat. Among the instances was the Loyalist radio's fables during Mola's march on Madrid. *The New York Times* correspondent in Mola's camp cabled: "Madrid had during the past two days been announcing over the radio the retreat of General Emilio Mola's force, but there is no evidence of a retreat here." (July 29, 1936). "It was announced two or three times last week that Ayazun had been destroyed and that the Rebels had been forced to retreat. All those reports are false." (*Ib.* Aug. 11, 1936)

In Toledo, where the Fascists held the ancient fortress of Alcazar, the workers were losing many lives on the surrounding barricades. One air bombing could have transformed the old structure into rubble, but the People's Front Government refrained from any such real anti-Franco action. In an interview with a correspondent, one of the Socialist leaders of the Popular Front, Indalicio Prieto, made some startling admissions: " 'The government forces,' he continued, 'have not been used up to now to their full efficiency, as would have been done in case of a foreign invasion. I take as a typical example that of Toledo, where a group of rebel officers is entrenched. It would have been very easy for one of our bombing planes to blow up the Alcazar, but our enemies are Spaniards, as we are, and this palace is one of our most precious art treasures.' " (*N.Y.T.* Aug. 4, 1936)

Such were the openly expressed sentiments of a Socialist toward the Fascist assassins! "Our enemies are Spaniards, as we are" veiled the true reason for the Socialist sabotage of the fight against Fascism. Prieto's statement stripped him of his false face of "defense of democracy" and disclosed that when Capitalism required the instrument of Fascism the Socialist policy was *not* to defend the democratic form of the bourgeois State.

Shortly after Prieto had so wholeheartedly approved the tactic of withholding the Air Force from attacking the Fascist officers in the Alcazar, this Socialist assistant of Franco was appointed Minister of Air and Marine. The Stalin and Socialist demagogues assured the workers that Prieto would organize these two branches into effective weapons against the Fascists!

While large detachments of workers and troops were thus pinned down around Alcazar and other Fascist strongholds, Franco and Mola, meeting little obstruction, were expanding their domain. When Franco, virtually unhindered, reached Toledo to relieve the Alcazar (Sept. 27, 1936), he was completely indifferent to the fact that the besiegers *were Spaniards too,* and butchered thousands of them because they were *workers* subjectively opposed to Fascism and above all to Capitalism.

In clearing the path for Franco, the Popular Front Government

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was encumbered by the overwhelmingly anti-Fascist Navy and Air force. They could have easily halted the ferrying of Fascist troops from Morocco. Yet in the first days of the rising Franco operated across the Strait of Gibraltar with fantastic freedom of action. The Loyalist Navy was without sailing orders, while the Air Force waited hopefully for definite instructions. Such a situation could endure only for a very brief time. Aroused by the perplexing inactivity of the authorities, the sailors would, without doubt, have turned their wrath upon the sabotaging Republican officers. To forestall such an eventuality some ships were dispatched into the Straits. Then Franco's ferrying took to the air. But to confine the ferrying of Fascist troops to planes was to reduce reinforcements to a trickle. The Azana Government, therefore, withdrew its ships, presumably to avoid encounter with Nazi warships which put in their appearance in Spanish waters off Ceuta and Cadiz (August 4, 1936). The revolutionary-tempered sailors, however, were not cowed by the Nazi warships, and were determined to bar Franco's way across the Strait at all costs.

On August 7, 1936, the Loyalist warships returned and opened a bombardment of the Franco-held city of Algeciras on the Spanish coast. The British consulate was hit. Though still operating under the sham standard of neutrality, the British Government, under the pretext of protecting British lives and property, immediately brought its Navy into play, assumed the patrol of the Strait and ruled out any fighting between the Loyalist and Franco forces in Strait waters. In this guise Franco's way was cleared for ferry operations. "Although British neutrality is still maintained, the patrol of the Strait and the closing of the harbor will aid the military Rebels because Loyalist warships cannot attempt to take Algeciras, now in Rebel hands, and completely isolate the Rebels from Morocco. The Rebels now can release some troops, who were rushed back to Algeciras, for duty further north in the drive for Madrid." (*N.Y.T.* Aug. 11, 1936)

It was only after an interval which permitted Franco to bring in considerable reinforcements, that the Loyalist sailors forced Azana to send the ships back to the Strait, in disregard of the British Fleet.

In the first stage of the war the Fascist command was uneasy about the Loyalist Air Force. The Loyalist airmen on bombing missions carried them out in earnest. "The Rebels have been severely handicapped by the superiority of Madrid's air force. Headquarter sources revealed that bombing by Loyalist planes played the greatest part in holding up General Mola's advance on Madrid over the Guadarrama Mountains." (*Ib.* Aug. 12, 1936)

There was but one thing the Loyalist Government could do to remedy the situation: sabotage its Air Force until the scanty Fascist aviation was decisively increased through the regular arrivals of planes from Hitler and Mussolini. Under the pretext that the Loyalist aviators might desert to Franco, the Government kept most of the Air Force

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

grounded. "Madrid said to distrust men in the air force: Fear of desertions limits attacks by plane." (*Ib.* Aug. 18, 1936)

We have been unable to discover a single report showing desertions from the Air Force to Franco. Franco's attitude toward captured Loyalist aviators showed that he knew they had no sympathy for Fascism. Just five days before the People's Front Government expressed its lack of confidence in its pilots, Franco captured forty Loyalist aviators in the occupation of San Rafael Espinar. Everyone of them was shot! Reports about Fascist executions of Loyalist aviators were so frequent as to expose the hypocrisy of the Government's pretext. And while Franco openly employed Hitler's and Mussolini's pilots, the Azana Government refused the services of foreign fliers: "Many Russians, Polish and Mexican fliers have offered their services, it was said, but the government professes reluctance to employ them because interna tional complications might result." (*Ib.*)

There was little doubt among military experts that in the Air Force the Government had a decisive weapon. What stood in the way of smashing Franco was the calculated treachery of the Loyalist authorities: "Were it not for this lack of confidence, military tacticians point out, whole squadrons of planes could be thrown against enemy strongholds to end the revolt." (*Ib.*) The Azana Government not only made every effort to keep the Air Force from battling the Fascists but also tried to prevent the militiamen from firing at Franco's planes, as in the instance of the Fascist air raids on San Sebastian: "The Madrid Government ordered residents of San Sebastian today to make no effort to shoot down Rebel airplanes but to hide in bombproof shelters during raids." (*Ib.* Aug. 15, 1936)

The systematic extermination of the class-conscious proletariat of Spain by the Fascists evoked among the workers an insistent demand for retaliation. But the policy of the Government was to deliver the entire working class vanguard to the Fascist assassination and simultaneously to protect the lives of the assassins. After wholesale massacres of working class prisoners at La Linea, Granada, Algeciras, Merida and other towns, the "Loyalist forces were urged today to respect the lives of prisoners, regardless of the action of the rebels." (*Ib.* Aug. 13, 1936). Vastly perturbed the workers began to register their resentment. Reports in the capitalist press abroad spoke of "The split between the government and militia." (*Ib.* Aug. 17, 1936). The Workers vaguely sensed that for some reason the Government stood between them and victory. The Fascists were killing with the ferocity of a tiger but the Government tried to make the workers behave toward the murderers as gently as lambs. Alarmed by the aroused workers the Azana-Giral regime had to carry out some executions. And though secretly pro-Fascist, the Republicans had to pretend approval even of unauthorized action of the workers themselves. That the complex situation distressed the Republican bourgeoisie is clear. When General Goded, who had instituted a mass butchery in the Balearic Islands,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was shot by the workers of Catalonia, the Republican press described the execution as "painful duty." (*Ib.* Aug. 18, 1936)

Seeing on every hand the growing disaffection among the workers, the People's Front burocrats were forced to level "criticism" against the Government. A Stalinist leader, discussing the "siege" of the Alcazar with an American correspondent, voiced objection to the Government tactics: " 'It is impossible to win the war with such delicate tactics,' the Communist added. He reported rising resentment among Communist and anarchist workers, who make up the hurriedly enlisted government militia." (*Ib.* Aug. 17, 1936)

The uninterrupted accumulation of anti-Government feeling presaged a violent explosion against the civilian Fascists in the Loyalist territory and, above all, at the Fascist towns ringed by the workers' militias and in the path of the advancing Fascist troops. With the idea of saving the situation, the leaders of the People's Front effected a new shift in personnel of the regime. On September 4, 1936 Giral resigned and the Left Socialist Largo Caballero, by reason of his infinite capacity for supplying colorful "revolutionary" covers for the fundamental purposes of the bourgeoisie, was called upon to assume the premiership.

12. *Stalin's Powerful Weapon of Deception: "Material Aid"*

For the grim task of wiping out the proletarian vanguard of Spain, Franco required an abundance of guns, planes and other means of mass murder. These could be procured only from the great munition trusts of the big powers. But the workers in the bourgeois democratic countries would have been incensed if munitions were openly shipped to the butchers of the Spanish masses. The governments of the "democracies" therefore, were forced to make a show of restraint and to create an official body which could cover up the sending of supplies to Franco.

On August 1, 1936 Leon Blum, the Socialist head of the Popular Front Government of France, formulated a policy of "Non-intervention" in the Spanish situation. Mussolini accepted the principle of the "Non-intervention" on August 6, and Hitler on August 8. A general "Nonintervention Committee" was created which performed several functions. First of all its formation placed Franco on an equal footing with the Azana Government, although according to bourgeois legal standards he was a rebel attacking a legally constituted universally recognized authority which had been democratically elected by a majority of the Spanish electorate. The "democracies" realized that in Spain the struggle involved the suppression of the turbulent working class and insurrectionary peasantry, not "democracy versus Fascism." The formation of the Nonintervention Committee, while raising the status of Franco, reduced the Azana Government to a status of semi-legality. Roosevelt and other heads of the "democracies" placed an embargo on shipments of munitions to Spain. They thereby deprived

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the legally constituted Government of Spanish "democracy" of the international right established by the capitalist powers themselves to import war material openly and officially for the purposes of stamping out an internal rebellion. On the other hand, from the outset, Hitler and Mussolini, under the cover provided them by the "democracies" which controlled all sea lanes to Spain, opened the flood-gates of war supplies and troops to Franco. The "Reference History" of *Webster's New International Dictionary* records for 1938: "Although the Joint Committee on Nonintervention in Spain is in nominal existence, the war has continued throughout the year with material support from Germany and both material and military support from Italy." (310[26])

Since the Spanish workers were under the spell of the demagogues of the People's Front who said that the Azana regime fought for democracy, they hoped that the "sister-democracies," France, England and the United States would furnish Azana material assistance. But above all they looked for help to Stalin, the head of the only existing "revolutionary" government.

To lend an air of sincerity to the "Nonintervention" scheme and thereby to insure Franco's victory, the Stalin Government on August 5, 1936 announced its adherence to the Nonintervention Committee and also banned war supplies to Spain (*N.Y.T.* Aug. 31, 1936). By October, when the Spanish masses were again under the control of the People's Front, Stalin unofficially lifted the embargo. Since the outcome of the struggle of the masses would be decided by his politics which guaranteed the victory of Franco, the arms Stalin would send to Spain could never stop Fascism. However, he was compelled to ship war supplies for appearance's sake. At the same time he could flaunt the "Soviet help" to bolster the prestige of his Spanish and international henchmen.

Reports soon appeared that the Moscow and Leningrad factories had begun producing clothing for Spanish children. Russian ships loaded with supplies began to arrive in Spain. The first vessel, *Zirya-nin,* docked in Barcelona on October 15, 1936. It was enthusiastically greeted by the entire working class population of the city. Welcoming Stalin's ship was the head of the Catalan Government and his "proletarian" ministers including the leaders of the POUM. At the end of October 1936 a number of Russian tanks rolled through the streets of the cities, and Russian planes roared in the Spanish skies. "The toilers of the Soviet Union," wrote Stalin to Jose Diaz, "only do their duty when they give all the aid within their power to the revolutionary masses of Spain." (October 16, 1936). Stalin's agents dinned into the ears of the workers repeated references to Stalin's "assistance." "I can assure you," said Ibarruri in a speech in Valencia, "that all the wealth of the world could not repay the help the Soviet Union has given us."

There was not a single voice in Spain exposing Stalin's "material aid" snare. Every political party, from the Azana Republicans to the POUM, shouted hosannas to "Soviet help."

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

13. *Secret Contact of the Stalin-Azana-Caballero Dictatorship with Franco*

As the tide of Civil War rose higher and higher, the Spanish bourgeoisie eagerly relinquished on an ever-increasing scale political and military guidance to Stalin's agents. The Stalin-Socialist-Liberal plot was to wipe out all democracy in Loyalist areas under the guise of defending it and to bring the masses under the iron heel of centralized military rule. The scheme called for the annihilation of the most dangerous section of the working class, the militant, subjectively anti-Stalinist workers of the POUM and the Left Anarchist workers who were to a degree under the POUM's influence. Once these two measures were accomplished, the entire project of bringing victory to Franco was assured of full success.

All the essentials of the Stalin-Socialist-Liberal plot were organized and coordinated behind a Left parliamentary screen. In the Cabinet there were eight "proletarian" ministers and only five bourgeois. Of the eight, six were Socialists and two Stalinists; the bourgeois ministers were all of the Left republican parties, one representing Catalonia to link its policies with Spain. Soon two more "proletarian" ministers were added, both Anarcho-syndicalists who had shelved their romantic "anti-Statism" until the proletariat was safely tied to the bourgeois State. The head of the Cabinet and War Minister, Largo Caballero, was advertised among the workers as the "Spanish Lenin." Where did that fraud orginate? Luis Araquistain, editor of Caballero's paper, *Cralidad*, stated that "The initiative in the use of this title came from Moscow." (*El Communismo y la Guerta Le Spana*). The power behind this official "anti-Fascist" screen was the Stalin burocrats. Marcel Rosenberg, Stalin's Ambassador, attended all the sessions of Caballero's Cabinet (*N.Y.T.* Dec. 7, 1936), and "It was Mr. Rosenberg who handpicked the Largo Caballero Cabinet." (*Ib.*)

A host of Stalin's experts arrived in a stream from the Soviet Union and began to take over the key posts in the real apparatus behind the Government facade. As in the Chinese Revolution, Red Army officers appeared in Spain, and Stalin's General Goriev entered Caballero's War Office to supervise the unification of various militias connected with different political parties into one Republican Army under the unofficial Stalin control.

The original Azana-Franco preparations apparently included the simple tactic of leaving a number of Fascist officers in the Republican Army. They displayed outward loyalty to the Republic while guiding the Fifth Column as well as supplying military information and advice to Franco. The continual discovery of the treachery of these Fascist officers, coupled with General Qeuipo de Llano's incautious revelation over the Fascist radio that some people in the Republican forces were supplying him with information, fully support this assumption. Fascist officers in Spain had direct connectons with these Republican officers, as was admitted by the Comintern: "The combined

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

military skill of the German and Italian general staffs in Spain was having effect. These general staffs were directly connected with many officers in the republican army." (*The Communist,* August 1937, 701)

Not only were officers in the Republican Army in touch with Franco but so were such high officials as the Socialist leader Negrin, Finance Minister in Caballero's Cabinet and later Premier of the Popular Front Government. Negrin's connection with Franco, Hitler and Mussolini is revealed in a letter written by him, as quoted by a historian Salvador De Madariaga. (*Spain,* 414). No wonder, then, that Franco was receiving extremely valuable military information from the Republican camp: "The Government's most secret military plans reach the rebels almost as soon as they are issued." (*N. Y. World Telegram,* Oct. 29, 1936)

14. *Stalinist Sabotage and Deception at Madrid*

The major military objective in Franco's original strategy was Madrid. But evidently Stalin and his bourgeois allies realized the danger in a Fascist occupation of Madrid at the very start of the war. The People's Front Government would have tottered and the center of proletarian physical resistance to Fascism would have automatically shifted to Catalonia where the militant Left Anarchist and POUM workers represented a potential threat to Stalin and Franco. The task of Fascization would have been crushingly costly in life and property to the Spanish bourgeoisie and would have required infinitely difficult maneuvering on Stalin's part to secure a strong foothold in Catalonia.

Stalin and the Spanish bourgeoisie realized that the most effective means of taking full control of Catalonia was through the Central Government. They had to bolster the prestige of the Azana regime, and Madrid was essential for achieving this end. There was sound reasoning in having Franco reverse his strategy and proceed first to crush the workers in other cities. That would give Stalin the needed time to destroy the fifty thousand militant members of the POUM and as many more of the "uncontrollable" Left Anarchist workers. Catalonia could then be handed over to Franco without much trouble, and, for his *final triumph,* he would be given Madrid.

But apparently in the early weeks no such plan had been laid down. Franco's Moors and Foreign Legionnaires advanced upon the capital with incredible swiftness, carrying everything before them. Madrid was besieged. But certain mysterious features began to appear almost at once. Franco could have easily surrounded the city and sealed off any contact with the rest of People's Front territory. Yet he left an open passage to the east. Through this passage Azana was allowed to depart freely on October 19, 1936 to Barcelona. On November 6, 1936 Caballero's Cabinet left for Valencia unmolested. Although the Fascist troops "besieged" Madrid for three years, Franco's forces did not cut that road until virtually the last day of the civil war.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Officially the People's Front Government placed the capital in the hands of General Miaja. In actuality the man behind Miaja was Stalin's General Goriev. For his loyal work of delivering the workers to Franco's machine-guns he was "rewarded" in his usual Stalin way: "He had organized the defense of Madrid. More than any one man he was the savior of Madrid. (He was shot in the big Moscow purge.)." (Louis Fischer, *Men and Politics,* 398)

Refugees from the Hitler and Mussolini terror, volunteers from many countries of Europe and America, imagining they were offering their lives in a struggle against Fascism, were streaming toward Madrid. Stealing in from France, they trudged on foot across the snow-covered Pyrenees; others arrived secretly by boat at Loyalist ports and rushed to place themselves at Miaja's—really Goriev's command. Under the slogan "Madrid will be the tomb of Fascism" Goriev and Miaja made Madrid the tomb of most of these volunteers known as International Brigaders. To enter Madrid, the International Brigades used the road mysteriously left open by Franco.

On November 8, 1936 the first International Brigade, composed mostly of French Stalinist workers, marched into Madrid, the masses all along the route greeting them with thunderous cries "Viva Stalin!" "Viva Russia!" Poorly armed and with little ammunition the Brigade was next day thrown against Franco's artillery, tanks and machine-guns, and suffered terrific losses. The second International Brigade arrived a week later and, also wretchedly equipped, was sent to meet the fire of Franco's well-armed Moors and Foreign Legionnaires.

The Government naturally could not too markedly block the use of its growing arsenals. It even had to release some artillery and tanks. But it did its best to leave great empty spaces on the fronts and hold back the supply of munitions. An uncensored dispatch sent by courier from Madrid to Paris stated: "It is significant that the War ministry is filled with cases of ammunition, which never seem to get to the front." (*N.Y.T.* Oct. 18, 1936)

Arms and munitions were being produced in the Loyalist territory and supplies were brought in from abroad. On November 9, 1936 the Spanish Stalinists in their paper *Mundo Obrero* stated, "We possess everything needed to enable us to pass to the offensive." But the Stalin-Azana government maneuvered to supply the International Brigades with obsolete, practically worthless weapons: "Even in March, 1937, professor J.B.S. Haldane found the British battalion of the International Brigade under orders to take Italian and German machine-gun positions with rifles dating from the eighties and nineties of last century. Another visitor has frequently seen rifles in use marked 'Oviedo 1896.'" (Duchess of Atholl, M. P. *Searchlight on Spain,* 93)

With every conceivable excuse, *to the very end,* the Stalin-Azana-Socialist partnership conducted the policy of saving Fascist lives. When the Caballero Cabinet was about to quit Madrid, the Socialist Minister

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Negrin went to sleep in the city prison to protect the Fascists there from possible attack. On leaving, he turned over that task to a visiting member of the British Parliament. Generally, the arrest of Fascists was made for their protection. Caballero's Socialist Minister Galarza was arresting Franco's Fifth Columnists in Madrid and then secretly releasing them. The Stalin burocrats "criticised" in retrospect this game of the Socialist Minister: "When agents of the Fifth Column were arrested by functionaries of the secret police, they went into prison one day by one door and left it the next day by the other. This was the work of the Minister of the Interior, Galarza." (Andre Marty, *Heroic Spain,* 13-14)

Even such brutal assassins as the Fascist airmen, whose sport was to drop bombs upon civilians and hospitals or to fly at low altitude and spray the streets with bullets, received immunity from the People's Front Government. The Fascists understood that a class war was being fought in Spain and they paid no attention to the legal niceties of warfare or to the finer points of bourgeois morality. They indiscriminately butchered workers—whether captured with arms in hand, or wounded, or civilians, women, children or aged. Franco's dictum, which he pronounced over the radio, was, "a bomb dropped on a hospital sometimes means more than a victory." Interviewed by foreign bourgeois correspondent early in the uprising, Franco indicated that he was ready to shoot half of the population of Spain. (*New Chronicle,* July 29 ,1936)

The Stalin-Azana government utilized the humane proprieties of warfare in holding the workers in leash to prevent them from wreaking their vengeance upon Franco's ruthless pilots. Miaja, on November 14, 1936 issued a special order to the Madrid population giving protection to captured Fascist pilots. He threatened dire punishment, which meant summary execution, if his order were disobeyed. As if in mockery Fascist airmen on that very day killed many Madrid workers at a huge meeting in Central Plaza where they had been gathered by the Stalin and Socialist burocrats "to discuss the defense of Madrid." (*N.Y.T.* Nov. 15, 1936) A day after Miaja's order, Fascist fliers parachuted several boxes down on Madrid. One, upon being opened "contained the mutilated body of a loyalist airman." (*Ib.* Nov. 17, 1936). The correspondent did not state what the contents of the other "mysterious" boxes were.

We have cited elsewhere that the policy of the Loyalist regime was to keep its Air Force as inactive as possible. A revealing bit of testimony is furnished by Louis Fischer, the first American to join the International Brigade:

"A giant German junkers bomber rested on the ground. It had flown from Germany with other machines but lost its way and landed at Madrid with a crew of four. It had three motors. I climbed into it, moved some levers, touched the bomb racks.

'Why don't you use it?' I asked the commandant of the airdrome.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

'We obey orders,' he replied.

"I talked to Foreign Minister Julio Alvarez del Vayo about the junkers. He looked sad. 'The French Embassy,' he said to help me understand. It was still difficult to understand. Out of consideration for France, the Spanish Repubic did not use a German machine. The machine had flown over France from Germany. It was concrete proof that Germany was violating 'Non-Intervention.' Yet the French Foreign Office had seen fit to warn Madrid not to complicate French relations with Germany by including the junkers in its own air force." (*Men and Politics,* 363). To get the Popular Front Government officials out of the embarrassing position before the workers, the Nazis obligingly eliminated the difficulty: "Several weeks later, the Nazis bombed the Madrd airfield and smashed their own junkers." (*Ib.* 364)

In the Franco camp providing for the troops was of prime importance. Describing the condition of the Fascist soldiers, a correspondent of *The New York Times* stated, "the troops are well fed" and, "The men are also warmly clothed and shod. Their khaki uniforms are covered by ponchos, big woolen blankets cut like cloaks with openings in the middle for their heads. They all wear sturdy watertight trench boots." (Nov. 29, 1936). In the camp of Stalin-Azana-Caballero the picture was different, although no shortages of supplies were involved. Louis Fischer, at the time a Stalinist supporter, was stirred to write: "The stores in Madrid still have heavy stocks of winter underwear, warm blankets, and flannel garments while four kilometers away the men who are defending the city sleep lightly clothed in frozen trenches." (*The Nation,* Dec. 12, 1936)

15. *Stalin Frames the Proletarian Vanguard*

The Fascists dug in at Madrid and turned their attention to the less advanced section of Spain. In accord with his plans Stalin took measures preparatory to unleashing the savage brutality of his GPU on the most advanced workers of Spain. Since the "pure" Trotsky organization in Spain, recently reestablished by a few imported Trotskyites, was numerically insignificant, Stalin centered his fury upon the semi-Trotskyist POUM and upon the "uncontrollable" Left Anarchist workers. The November 1936 issue of *The Communist International* published a vicious slander: "When an air raid was in progress one night in Madrid, a gang of Trotskyites took advantage of the darkness to commit the cowardly assassination of a group of active members of the Party." Going a step further the Stalin burocrats alleged that "while the People's Militia were conducting an heroic struggle near Sierra Guadarrama, a terrorist plot of fascist-Trotskyites was discovered, aimed at the murder of Jose Diaz, Dolores, Largo Caballero and Azana." (1432)

Early in December 1936 the Republican and the Stalin press of Barcelona published a rabid attack on the POUM by the Stalin Consul Antonov-Ovseenko, a former leader of the Russian Left Opposi-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tion. He denounced the POUM as a Fascist organization and hinted at the grim fate in store for it. On December 12 the POUM'ists were ejected from the Catalonian Government, a Left cover no longer being needed by the bourgeoisie. A few days later an ominous threat came from the Kremlin Dictator himself: "As for Catalonia, the purging of Trotskysts and the Anarcho-Syndicalists has begun; it will be conducted with the same energy with which it was conducted in the U.S.S.R." (*Pravda,* Dec. 17, 1936)

Stalin was sharpening the knife in full view of his intended victims. But the leadership of the POUM and the workers who followed it were without a means of escape. It was now too late to arrest Stalin's hand. The Spanish masses were with him. The leaders of the POUM themselves, under Trotsky's guidance, had nurtured the Stalinist monster and doomed the key section of the proletarian vanguard as well as themselves. Having set out upon a fundamentally Trotskyist course of rendering Stalin support with "criticism" the POUM leaders could never tear themselves out of the Stalinist orbit. The only correct step would have been an abrupt denunciation of their own political past. Failing in that they could only facilitate Stalin's task, mumbling the customary Trotsky frauds: "mistakes of the Comintern" and "the Stalinists were unable to draw lessons from the struggle." (*Spanish Revolution,* I, No. 4). Even when Stalin's axe was raised over their heads, they continued working for Stalin. Thus, when Hans Beimler lost his life while carrying out Stalinist perfidy in the International Brigades the POUM surrounded his name with a "revolutionary" halo:

"While fighting on the Madrid front as political leader of the German section in the International Brigade, Hans Beimler recently met his death. His career in the proletarian cause and his acts of bravery and solidarity at the present time were such that his party affiliation can make no difference to our feeling of regret for his death. Hans Beimler had been a Communist deputy in the Reichstag and belonged to the Central Committee of the German Communist Party. At his funeral last week in Barcelona he received full revolutionary honors and every revolutionary and anti-fascist organization sent representatives to march in the procession. The P.O.U.M. also paid their last tribute, in spite of the fact that we were the only party not invited to attend." (*Spanish Revolultion,* Dec. 23, 1936)

While the POUM was building up the Stalin burocrats as revolutionary fighters for proletarian freedom, the latter were stepping up the pace for the physical annihilation of the POUM. In Madrid the POUM daily newspaper *El Combatente Rojo* was suppressed and the POUM radio was seized by Caballero's police (Feb. 7, 1937). The Catalan Generality ordered the suspension of the POUM's central organ, *La Batalla* (March 17, 1937). Besides striking at the POUM, the Stalin-Azana-Caballero dictatorship brought its heavy hand down upon the militant elements of the Anarcho-Syndicalist C.N.T. which

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

attempted, quite meekly, to voice a protest against the "democratic" couter-revolution. Bourgeois democracy throughout Spain was but a memory now. The Stalin-Azana-Caballero dictatorship was moving toward an iron military rule, but the leaders of the POUM were aiding Stalin by asserting that the Stalin burocrats were fighting *for* bourgeois democracy.

In the Spring of 1937, when the Spanish workers, infected with the Comintern virus, were cursing the "fascist POUM," when the streets were plastered with sinister posters showing Hitler's face behind a mask marked "POUM"—posters signed openly "Partido Communista de Espana"—the POUM leaders issued a thesis urging the formation of a government of *all* political parties within the proletariat (*Spanish Revolution,* April 21, 1937). This proposition included, naturally, the Communist Party of Spain!

The Stalin-Azana dictatorship made the military scene a large part of its politics. To command full confidence of the masses, it staged a dramatic "victory" over Franco's Italian troops at Guadalajara (March 13-18, 1937). With this "victory" as a powerful ideological shield, the Stalin-Azana Government fairly isolated the POUM and the extreme militant section of the Anarcho-Syndicalists led by the "Friends of Durruti." The Anarchist burocracy, cooperating, expelled the "uncontrollable" elements. These workers and the POUMists were branded as "hidden Fascist agents."

16. *The Stalin Assassins Strike*

On May 3, 1937 an armed force commanded by a Stalin myrmidon stormed the Barcelona central telephone building occupied by the Left Anarcho-Syndicalist workers. The attack was a signal for unleashing a civil war inside the Loyalist territory. Barricades sprang up all over the city, with street fighting continuing for several days. Surprisingly, the tide of battle in the beginning turned against the Stalin burocrats and the bourgeoisie. On May 4, 1937, as on July 19, 1936, the revolutionary workers exercised their own initiative and took control of the main railroad station and a large outer section of Barcelona. But sabotage by the leaders unfolded at once. Later in the day the Anarchist Regional Committee of the CNT issued a radio call for unity: "We appeal to all of you to put down your arms."

The workers at first were deaf to all appeals and clung to the barricades. Then the Stalin and the Anarchist leaders resorted to ruses. The next day the CNT and the Stalin-controlled UGT issued a joint manifesto, stating: "The anti-fascist organizations and Parties in session at the Palace of the Generalidad have solved the conflict that has created this abnormal situation." A treacherous note was slyly inserted to trap the barricade fighters: "These events have taught us that from now on we shall have to establish relations of cordiality and comradeship, the lack of which we all regretted deeply during

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the last few days." (Cited by Felix Morrow in *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Spain,* 93)

The Stalinist stratagem and the treachery of the Anarchist leaders shook the morale of the workers; and then the POUM added its demoralizing voice to the deceptive CNT-UGT Manifesto. It told the workers that their struggle had been victorious and called them back to the shops: "The counter-revolutionary provocation having been repulsed, it is necessary to leave the streets. Workers return to work." (*La Batalla,* May 6, 1937)

In an atmosphere of confusion and betrayal, many workers abandoned the struggle, while others lingered on. Meanwhile thousands of Azana's Assault Guards were on their way to put down the revolutionary workers of Barcelona. The policy Azana was going to pursue was clearly enunciated by the Stalin organ *Mundo Obrero* of May 7, 1937: "It is time to exterminate the P.O.U.M. and all men and groups who play the game of Franco, Hitler and Mussolini inside other groups."

17. *The Stalin-Azana-Negrin Dictatorship Exterminates the POUM*

The Stalin-provoked civil war in Catalonia marked a sharp turn to the elimination of all "democracy." On May 15, 1937 Caballero gave way to a Right Socialist regime of Dr. Juan Negrin whose professed aim was "to use an iron hand to maintain internal order." (*N.Y.T.,* May 19, 1937). A ruthless repression was instituted under the perennial promise of bringing the war to a rapid victorious conclusion. Dolores Ibarruri christened the Negrin regime "The Government of Victory." It received the fullest support of the half-million members of the Stalin organizations in Spain and Catalonia, of the immense majority of the Stalin-Socialist U.G.T., of a huge number of the right Anarcho-Syndicalists and of all the Republican groups.

In assuming control of the affairs in Loyalist Spain, Stalin had transplanted a section of his political police—the G.P.U.—to the Spanish soil. The agents of the G.P.U. infiltrated into the mass organizations and applied the same methods as in Russia. They set up secret torture chambers and carried out arrests, kidnappings and assassinations. Everyone who failed to voice support to the Stalin-Azana regime was in mortal danger of being denounced as an agent of Franco. Just as Stalin's Ambassador Marcel Rosenberg guided the policy of the Azana regime and Stalin's General Goriev and others directed the Republican military machine, so the G.P.U. managed the police.

On June 16, 1937 the Stalin-Azana-Negrin police arrested the leader of the POUM, Andres Nin, and forty members of the POUM Executive Committee. Next day all the POUM buildings were seized, thousands of members and chance visitors were whisked away. In July the mutilated body of the POUM leader was found on a road near Madrid. In reply to persistent inquiries, Stalin's agent in the former Caballero Cabinet, Alvarez del Vayo, stated that the victim had been

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

murdered by his own supporters. It was the typical Stalin technique, later used in the murder of the chief guardian and scape-goat of the Stalin burocracy, Leon Trotsky.

Like a mighty octopus, the G.P.U. seized its helpless prey. Trotskyists, POUMists, members of the Left Anarchist "Friends of Durruti" and, last but not least, members of the Stalin and Socialist organizations were disappearing. The Stalin-Azana-Negrin terror swept also through the Loyalist army, hitting particularly the International Brigades. The purges assumed a wholesale character. The chief bogey all along was "Trotskyism." Cried Ibarruri: "The Trotskyites must be exterminated and destroyed like beasts of prey, for otherwise, at the decisive moment, when our forces will want to take the offensive, we will be unable to do so on account of the disorders provoked in our rear by the Trotskyites." (*Frente Rojo,* Aug. 9, 1937)

The Spanish masses, on the strength of assurances of ultimate victory over Franco, gave hearty approval to the assassination measures of the Stalin-Azana-Negrin dictatorship. Autocratic command, implicit obedience, a decree prohibiting political propaganda in the Army—all were sold to the broad masses as the required means to the desired end. Gradually criticism of the Stalinist counter-revolution was reduced by terror to awe-struck whispers not only among the secret POUMists and left Anarcho-Syndicalists but even among the Caballero Socialists. To all this the masses acquiesced. "The sympathy of the people is today with the agent of authority, not against." wrote the London *Times* on October 8, 1937.

Stalin secured greater confidence and support of the Spanish masses on something more tangible than verbal promise of victory. Hard on the heels of the formation of the Negrin Cabinet a few rapid military "successes" were enacted. The Loyalist army was ordered to take Brunette, a heavily fortified Fascist stronghold west of Madrid. The double purpose behind the Brunette maneuver was to destroy a large number of advanced workers and at the same time to present the masses with a "victory." For the Loyalist army the "battle" of Brunette was one of the bloodiest of the whole Civil War. Brunette was occupied (July 1937) and the Franco forces withdrew some miles to the west. Other horrible "victorious" bloodbaths were engineered, a notable one at Teruel. At the same time Franco was compensated in the north with the important towns of Bilbao, Santander and Gijon.

By eradicating every vestige of independent proletarian impulse among the workers, by fortifying the military dictatorship with sham victories and GPU terror, Stalin was accomplishing his goal. The more centralized and powerful the Stalin-Negrin rule grew in Spain, the closer was the disastrous finale of the Spanish proletarian upheaval.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

18. *Playing Down the Stalin Danger*

Throughout the Civil War the Trotsky forces in Spain were virtually non-existent by comparison with their former flourishing organization. Trotsky's policy for Spain was therefore rather theoretical; yet since the Spanish Revolution was of world-wide significance, his policy affected the whole international vanguard.

Previously the Trotsky movement had labored to create a powerful Communist Party in Spain. With the adoption of the thesis for the Fourth International in the fall of 1933, the Comintern was viewed by the Trotsky followers as a Frankenstein's monster which they had helped to create.

An immediate cause for their vexation was the extraordinary expansion of Stalin's influence in Spain. The Stalin burocrats took the Social Democracy completely in tow politically and to an extent organizationally. Their grip upon the masses was highly valued by the Spanish capitalist statesmen. An editor of *Pravda* reported from Madrid: "Azana tells me to tell the Russian people he greatly admires and appreciates the unity and organization of the Communist Party in Spain because of its powerful authority over the extensive popular masses." (*N.Y.T.* Aug. 30, 1936)

The Trotsky leaders undertook the task of stilling the alarm among the most advanced workers on whom the Stalin betrayal in Germany had left an indelible, though jumbled impression. The Trotsky "expert" on Spain, Morrow, therefore, administered these workers a shot of mental morphine: "Fortunately for the world proletariat, Stalinism in Spain does not command the forces it held in leash in Germany—and precisely because the lessons of Germany have entered the consciousness of the Spanish proletariat." (*C. W. in S.* 62)

The Trotsky leaders had launched the policy of playing down the Stalin danger long before the Franco uprising. Thus, in the spring of 1934, when the Stalin forces impressively surged to the fore, the Trotsky press reassured its alarmed readers: "Fortunately for the future of the Spanish revolution the Stalinist influenced is quite limited." (*Militant,* May 5, 1934)

When, unfortunately for the workers, the Stalin gang engineered the butchery of the Asturias the Trotsky leaders wrote: "Fortunately for the workers the Stalinists were not strong enough to do either much good or very much harm." (*Miltant,* Oct. 20, 1934)

19. *The Trotskyites Falsify All Tendencies*

In addition to misrepresenting their own movement, the Trotsky leaders distorted the political character of every other tendency in the Spanish proletarian camp. Early in 1934, in the days of the French Turn, Trotsky's inventive genius had divided Social Democracy into two diametrically opposed political wings: "To satisfy oneself with abstractions—'reformist', 'Second International'—is to ignore or blur

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the difference between a Social democracy which constitutes the power of the bourgeoisie, and a social democracy which participates in a revolution against the bourgeoisie." (Resolution on the French Turn, approved by the October Plenum of the L.C.I. B.L.). This invention was fully utilized by the Stalin burocracy. In his speech at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, Georgi Dimitrov, General Secretary of the Comintern, declared: "The assistance the Communists render to that section of Social-Democracy which is becoming revolutionary will be the more effective the more we intensify the fight against the reactionary camp of Social-Democracy which is participating in a bloc with the bourgeoisie."

On the eve of Franco's uprising the Trotsky leadership, in the manner of the French Turn in hinging the destiny of the proletariat upon the transformation of Social democracy, dreamed up a revolutionary future for the Spanish Left Socialists: "The reformism of the Right Wing Socialists and the Stalinists, the political nihilism of the anarcho-syndicalists, the organizational conservatism and political mounte-bankery of the Maurin-Nin group, hinder the development of the Left Socialists, but they cannot prevent it. In a word, the situation in Spain may be described as a race between reaction and the political maturity of the Left Socialists." (*Soc. App.* Aug. 1936, 12)

The Left Socialists raced not with Fascism but in a circle. Meantime Franco struck. But the Trotsky leadership continued whitewashing the Spanish Socialists, not only the Caballero Left but even the Prieto Center group. (Morrow, *C.W. in S.* 28). The Anarcho-Syndicalists, who presumably had been hindering the imaginary revolutionary transformation of the Left Socialists, and who now openly dropped their "anti-State" disguise and swung to the support of the bourgeois State, were pictured as fighting for the destruction of this State: "Five years of revolution were needed before anarcho-syndicalism would begin to break with its doctrinaire refusal to enter the political field and fight for a workers State." (8)

Only a short while later this brazen political repainting of Anarchism was dramatically shown to be a deceit. One of the leading guides of Spanish Anarchism, Garcia Oliver, in an interview with an American correspondent, emphatically pointed out that the Anarchists were opposed to the overthrow of the Spanish capitalist State: "In fluent French Garcia Oliver said: 'Our position is exactly opposite to that of the Bolsheviki in November 1917. They seized power with a program of social revolution which knew no limits. Power was thrust on us, but we have no such program. Our only struggle is against excessive action by the ultra-privileged classes.'" (*N.Y.T.* Aug. 27, 1936)

The Maurin-Nin organization, previously described by the Trotsky leadership as an ineffective obstruction in the path of the Left Socialists, suddenly assumed a Bolshevik color: "It was only after the present civil war broke out that the former Trotskyists (now in the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

POUM) again turned toward a Bolshevik policy." (Morrow, *C.W. in S.* 9)

All these contradictory falsifications helped to prevent the vanguard workers from making a systematic and correct analysis of each political tendency in the Spanish Revolution.

20. *Trotskyite Public Declamations on Bourgeois Democracy*

Nurtured on the Bolshevik tradition of 1917 the Trotsky membership emotionally rejected the Rightist Stalin slogan of support to bourgeois democracy. Most of the membership accepted what Lenin said: "Bourgeois democracy can be supported only by the partisans of capitalist slavery." (*C.W.* XVII, R. 43). Pretending that they devoutly adhered to the policy of struggle against capitalist slavery, and therefore against bourgeois democracy, Cannon, Shachtman and other Trotsky leaders made a lavish display of outward reverential regard for the scientifically-correct definitions on the subject. In a pamphlet *The People's Front* by James Burnham, a member of the National Committee of the American Trotsky group and an administrator of the political affairs of the group while in the Socialist Party, it was stated: "It may thus be seen that there is no basic *social* conflict between bourgeois democracy and fascism. If we examine social questions historically, as Marxism does, we find in a sense the contrary: fascism is the resultant of bourgeois democracy in the period of capitalist decline; bourgeois democracy is the precursor and the preparation for fascism."

The truth about the pro-Fascist role of bourgeois democracy was constantly reiterated in the Trotsky publications. "Bourgeois democracy cannot, will not stand against fascism." declared Shachtman in an editorial in *Socialist Appeal* of October 8, 1936. Again and again the Trotsky leaders pointed out: "The fraud of bourgeois democracy stands completely exposed in the era of declining capitalism as the precursor of fascism and war. Policies built upon the preservation of bourgeois democracy not only cannot bar fascism and stave off war —they actually pave the way for these twin evils." (*Ib.* March 19, 1938)

On the occasion of death of the German Socialist leader Kautsky who had supported bourgeois democracy in Germany and thus helped pave the way for Hitler, the Trotsky leaders drew an appropriate lesson: "Let the workers learn from his example the clear and unmistakable lesson that in the era of the decline of capitalism the system of bourgeois democracy, if it is not overthrown by the workers and replaced by the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, leads not to socialism—but to fascism." (*Ib.* editorial, March 26, 1938)

The Trotsky workers saw the formidable offensive power of the proletariat effectively paralyzed by the Spanish "democracy." Moreover, there were clear indications that the political differences between the Fascist and "democratic" camp were daily growing narrow-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

er. The Trotsky leaders recorded this progressive evolution of the Spanish capitalist democracy towards fascist forms: "When the civil war broke out, Spain was the most democratic country in the world, with all sections of the toiling population enjoying the greatest freedom of action and expression. In the two years that have elapsed, the Loyalist leaders have steadily brought their political regime closer to that which the fascists have already established in their conquered territory and which they seek to extend throughout Spain." (*Ib.* July 23, 1938)

Every alert and intelligent person studying the Spanish situation knew that bourgeois democracy had been replaced by two iron military dictatorships ruthlessly exercised in one half of the country by Franco and in the other by Stalin-Negrin. Back in 1936, before the Stalin-Azana had wiped out the POUM and the Left Anarcho-Syndicalist workers, even the bourgeois press had reported: "All semblance of democratic forms of Government in Spain disappears." (*N.Y.T.* Dec. 7, 1936). Trotsky himself admitted the similarities of the two halves of the Spanish capitalist State: "On Franco's side and Azana's there is military dictatorship, censorship, forced recruiting, hunger, blood and death. The abstract slogan 'for democracy' is sufficient for liberal newspapermen but not for the oppressed workers and peasants." (*Bulleten Oppositsii,* March-April 1939, 89)

There was one basic distinction, of course, between the "democratic" and the Fascist half of the Spanish bourgeois State. Capitalist democracy shackled the working class and placed its head upon the block; Fascism wielded the axe. This black role of Spanish bourgeois democracy was veiled, but some revelations, though meagre, came to light. The Socialist leader Prieto who had refused to bomb the Fascists in the Alcazar on the pretext that they were fellow Spaniards revealed how Loyalist "offensives" were conceived and with what purpose: "Furthermore, we have decided to proceed on the various fronts with a series of offensives for which we shall use the F.A.I. and C.N.T. elements first as shock troops. We have also decided to transfer these elements to the most dangerous sectors. Thus the Rebels themselves will help us to complete the clean-up, for which we should be grateful to them." (Quoted in *S. App.* July 16, 1938) Thus the Trotsky leaders knew that the "bourgeois democracy" of Spain was simply engaged in destroying the whole proletarian vanguard, relying primarily on Franco's bullets.

21. *Trotsky's Real Policy on Bourgeois Democracy*

Since the actual Trotsky line on Spain, as on every other vital issue, was dressed in outer theoretical garb, it escaped detection by virtually everybody inside and outside the Trotsky movement. A detailed study of the Trotsky publications sheds some light on what that line actually was. Several years after the betrayal, Cannon's journal recalled the Trotsky attitude toward the Azana regime: "By our atti-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tude to the Civil War in Spain we showed that, if we consider a conflict to be one between bourgeois democracy and fascism, we give material aid to the forces representing bourgeois democracy." (*Fourth Int.* July 1943, 213). And Max Shachtman, the very man who had pretended to teach the workers that bourgeois democracy leads to fascism (*S.A.* March 26, 1938), later, in an internal dispute with Cannon, cited Trotsky's (Crux's) thesis on support to bourgeois democracy: "In the Spanish Civil War, we rightly regarded the victory of the People's Front regime (bourgeois democracy) as the 'lesser evil' compared with the victory of Franco (Fascism). 'Everywhere and always, where and when revolutionary workers are not powerful enough immediately to overthrow the bourgeois regime, they defend from fascism even the rotten bourgeois democracy and especially do they defend their own position inside bourgeois democracy' (Crux). Bourgeois democracy was conducting a progressive war against fascism." ("What is at Issue in the Dispute on the Russian Question?" Dec. 26, 1938, 17)

And some years later Shachtman wrote openly about the old Trotsky line on Spain: "We, as well as the Cannonites, supported bourgeois democracy as a lesser evil in comparison with fascism." (*New Int.* April 1944, 102)

What strikes one in analyzing the maneuvers of these political soldiers of fortune is the *consciousness* of their own treachery and hypocrisy. Investigation discloses that the thesis "Fascism versus democracy" did not originate with the Comintern. Almost two years before the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, immediately upon the rise of the Nazis to power, Trotsky very inconspicuously introduced the idea. An open admission of this fact is contained in the Trotsky publication *The New International* for October 1938: "Immediately after the accession of Hitler, Trotsky wrote that the issue presenting itself to the masses was no longer Bolshevism versus Fascism but Fascism versus Democracy." (301). While publicly the Trotsky leadership was mouthing correct phrases, behind the scenes in the discussion on Spain Trotsky said: "In the Spanish Civil War the question involves democracy or Fascism." (*Internal Bul.* Oct. 1937, 38)

As we have indicated, the Spanish Civil War was not a conflict between two hostile sections of the bourgeoisie but between the united bourgeoisie on the one side and the Spanish proletariat betrayed by the Comintern, Social Democracy, Anarchism and Trotskyism on the other. Although Trotsky never put the matter in simple terms, he well knew the essence of the bloody tragedy: "The overwhelming majority of the exploiters of all political shades openly went over into the camp of Franco." (*S.A.* Jan. 8, 1938, 4). Nor was it difficult for Trotsky to see that the technical work of sabotaging the workers' armed resistance and of delivering them to the Fascists was performed by the Stalin-Negrin Government. But Trotsky's task was to assist Stalin, so he pictured that Government not as an auxiliary but as an *obstacle* to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Fascism! "The Stalin-Negrin government is a quasi-democratic obstacle on the road to socialism, but it is also an obstacle, not a very reliable or durable one, but an obstacle nonetheless, on the road to Fascism." (*I.B.* Oct. 1937, 58)

However, in accord with his customary two-faced methods, Trotsky felt compelled to write upon the delivery of Barcelona to Franco by the Stalin-Negrin "obstacle" to Fascism: "The destruction of Barcelona is a terrible blow to the world proletariat, but it is also a great lesson. The mechanism of the Spanish 'People's Front' as an organized deception and betrayal of the exploited masses is exposed to the fullest extent. The slogan of 'defense of democracy' has again revealed its reactionary essence and hollowness." (*Bul. Oppositsii,* Feb. 1939, 4)

22. *The Trotsky-Stalin Goal: Victory of Franco*

We have cited a number of statements by Trotsky and his lieutenants to show that the Trotsky movement supported the treacherous Stalin line of "Democracy versus Fascism" during the Spanish Civil War. In their well-filled store-house of facts they possessed definite evidence that neither the Comintern, nor the Anarchists, nor the Republicans, nor even the Leftmost Socialist leaders, ever lifted a political finger to defend bourgeois democracy—when the policy was to decapitate the proletariat and install Fascism. As with the Socialists and Stalin burocrats and Azana Republicans, so with the Trotsky leaders there was no choice of bourgeois democracy in Spain. This was demonstrably true after the May 1937 events in Catalonia when the People's Front Government wiped out all the remnants of bourgeois democracy in all Loyalist territory and accelerated the terrorist rule of Stalin's secret police. "Spain in grip of Stalinist G.P.U." wrote the Trotsky leaders in the *Socialist Appeal* of October 23, 1937. What the Trotskyites supported to the very end therefore was not bourgeois democracy "as the lesser evil" but a *military capitalist dictatorship piloted by Stalin's G.P.U.!* Trotsky, Cannon and Shachtman with rare ability and cool deliberation helped the Stalin-Azana-Negrin military dictatorship to send the trapped Spanish workers to the Fascist execution block.

The greatest means of deception in the hands of the Stalin-Azana dictatorship, as we have stated, was "material aid for Spain." To cover up the political line of betrayal, the Comintern burocrats all over the world made appeals for arms and supplies. "On one occasion, a whole train-full of supplies came through from France to Albacete. It was sent by the French Communist Party." (Fischer, *Men and Politics,* 387)

The bourgeoisie recognized the magnetic power of this deception and reduced the basically political and class nature of the Spanish crisis to the issue of material aid. "War in Spain hinges on military supplies." (*N.Y.T.* May 9, 1937). Such eminent bourgeois as former United States Secretary of State, Stimson, voicing support to the Loy-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

alist Government, stressed the question of supplies, (*Ib.* Jan. 23, 1939). Mrs. Thomas W. Lamont, wife of a banker of the house of J. P. Morgan, signed a petition for lifting the embargo on arms to the Loyalist Government.

While Trotsky's actual line of support to the fraud of "Democracy versus Fascism" was as elusive as a globule of mercury, his stand on the "material aid" deception could not be concealed and caused some resentment in the ranks of his followers. In 1936 Stalin's American satrap, Browder, organized a "North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy" (NAC). Many Liberals gave it support. The National Executive Committee of Norman Thomas' Socialist Party passed a resolution to enter this masked Stalinist Committee, and the Cannon-Shachtman group inside the Socialist Party adhered to the line of Thomas. A group of Trotsky workers, though they had swallowed the alluring bait of the French Turn, opposed their leaders' policy of entering the Stalin NAC. Writing in the Trotsky *Internal Bulletin* for October 1937, they noted the "criticism" trick whereby Cannon-Shachtman as ever induced their victims to support Stalin: "The instructions issued to the comrades are: 'In accordance with the N.E.C. resolution, we go into the NAC to build it up, but we fight for our position within it" (16). The oppositionists declared: "We are opposed to 'building' an organization of the Stalinists who use it to materially and politically strengthen the counter-revolution." These recalcitrant Trotsky workers never suspected, of course, that their leaders pursued a deliberate policy for the victory of counter-revolution.

To appear as opponents of Stalin, the Trotsky leaders were pressing their sham attack on the slogan "democracy versus fascism." Yet, as an apology for their support to "material aid," they broadcast the very opposite: "The government, though carrying out its liquidation of workers' power and its reconsolidation of bourgeois power behind the lines, was conducting a military struggle of a socially progressive character against the Fascist armies of Franco." (*S.A.* Aug. 14, 1937)

To secure support to his line on "Material Aid" Trotsky resorted to the approved Stalinist method of amalgam: "Only cowards, traitors or agents of fascism can renounce aid to the Spanish Republican armies." (Interview with Rep. of *Havas,* Feb. 7, 1937). But several months later Trotsky himself exposed the lie about the socially progressive nature of the Loyalist "struggle." Through a hypothetical deduction as to what would happen if the impossible occurred and the Spanish Republican Armies defeated Franco, he virtually disclosed the consciousness of his own political goal:

"However, even a full military victory of the so-called republican camp over General Franco would not signify the triumph of 'democracy.' The workers and peasants twice placed the bourgeois republicans and their left agents in power: in April 1931 and in February 1936. Both times the heroes of the People's Front ceded the victory of the people to the more reactionary and more serious representa-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tives of the bourgeoisie. The third victory, gained by the generals of the People's Front, will signify their inevitable agreement with the Fascist bourgeosie on the backs of the workers and peasants. Such a regime will be but a different form of a military dictatorship, perhaps without monarchy and without an openly dominating Catholic Church." (*S.A.* Jan. 15, 1938, 8)

What then was Trotsky's true purpose in calling for "Material aid" to the Loyalist Government if either victory or defeat of this Government would inevitably saddle the Spanish masses with some form of Fascist dictatorship!

23. *"Material Aid" Achieves its Purpose*

Politics, not armaments, is the determining factor in the class struggle, and it was *politics* not guns, that decided the outcome of the Spanish Civil War. The essence of the Loyalist Government politics was to conduct a *sham* war. The chief covers for the sham war were "Material aid," systematic expansion of Spanish war industry, the building up of an army of nearly three quarters of a million and militarization of the whole Loyalist territory. These covers gave the impression of a serious intent and effort to crush Franco.

Final plans for delivering the entire Loyalist territory to Franco were apparently worked out in the summer of 1938. Despite the secrecy, information about the contacts between the Loyalist Government and Franco leaked out and was noted by the Trotsky leaders: "Twice during the summer, Negrin made trips to Switzerland during which it is authoritatively reported that he held long interviews with representatives of Franco." (Editorial, *S.A.* Oct. 8, 1938). Although the Trotsky leadership did not go into the precise substance of the Negrin-Fascist interviews, their meaning was obvous.

On December 9, 1938 all the fighting forces of the Loyalist Government were placed under the absolute authority of Premier Negrin who proceeded to wind up the Spanish Civil War. Early in January 1939 the Government suddenly began a rapid withdrawal of its Army on the Catalonian front. This maneuver was cloaked on January 12 with a call for an additional 200,000 men to the colors and intensification of output of the war industries. No definite reason was given or seen for the precipitous retreat:

"Military observers were amazed at the speed of the government troops' withdrawal throughout lower Catalonia virtually without firing a shot except for rear guard actions to cover the retreat. They suggested that the government might be retiring to a 'surprise' defense line just inside the border of Barcelona province.

"These sources see little immediate danger to the capital itself. They said the orderly withdrawal of the government forces indicated that it might be part of a long-laid plan to make the most determined stand along the natural lines of mountain defenses near the provincial border." (*N.Y.T.,* Jan. 16, 1939)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Fascists unimpeded swept toward the important seaport of Tarragona. Since many militant workers were concentrated in Catalonia, the "democratic" Socialist dictator Negrin had to allay their anxiety, if not suspicions, and pretend that his regime planned to employ every available means to stop the Fascists. On January 14, all men and women from 17 to 55 years of age were ordered into military reserves and a decree was issued for the militarization of the industries, transport and food delivery. "The government reported it was entrenching for a strong stand in the Tarragona sector." (*Ib.* Jan. 15, 1939). But hardly a day passed before the Government handed Tarragona over to Franco *without even a semblance of a stand!* "Tarragona Falls Without Fighting. Scarcely firing a shot, the Spanish Insurgents swept through lower Catalonia yesterday and captured the seaport of Tarragona." (*Ib.* Jan. 16, 1939)

The next task of Stalin and the Spanish bourgeois democracy was to effect Franco's occupation of Barcelona, the great munition center, the key to Loyalist communications by land, sea and air, and, traditionally, the fortress of the most militant and advanced section of the Spanish proletariat.

Barcelona, with a population of over 2,000,000, with a large concentration of Loyalist troops and of militant workers, was an immense armed camp. Geographically the city was admittedly more defensible than Madrid. Everybody of political intelligence understood the importance of Barcelona. "If Barcelona falls the mainspring of the Republican machine is broken." (*Ib.* Jan. 26, 1939)

The strategists of the Loyalist camp realized that because of Barcelona's enormous arsenals, its huge number of troops and of militant workers and strong defensive position, the only way to consummate their scheme was to prevent *any* attempt to stop the Fascists. Otherwise a general battle might unfold and threaten the entire Franco enterprise. Feverish, last-minute preparations for a supposedly last ditch stand were made. "The Government mobilized Barcelona's entire population for military and civilian defenses, declared martial law, and threw up fortifications in the city for house to house defense..." (*N.Y. Post,* Jan. 25, 1939). The Stalinists, Socialists, Anarchists, and other Government agitators roared anathemas against Franco over the radio and reiterated that the defense would be furious. " 'The taking of Barcelona will not be an easy matter,' the Government had broadcast. 'The population of Barcelona is ready, and the city will be defended inch by inch, street by street, house by house.' " (*N.Y.T.* Jan. 26, 1939). Yet two days earlier a representative of Spanish "democracy" had given away the secret pro-Fascist game of the Loyalist Government: "Paris, Jan. 24.—The Spanish Foreign Minister, Julio Alvarez del Vayo, in a conference today with the French Foreign Minister, Georges Bonnet, admitted the Loyalist Government expected the early loss of Barcelona." (*N.Y.T.* Jan. 25, 1939)

Eevery news item from Barcelona enhanced the feeling that the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

city had become impregnable. "The Government's main defense lines are some miles to the east. Barcelona reports said the lines were the strongest yet built during the conflict. It was said the fortifications had been under construction for more than a year." (*Ib.*)

Many workers who believed in the thesis "Democracy versus Fascism," presumed that in Barcelona they would witness the greatest epic of the War. Not knowing the true reasons for the Madrid siege, they calculated that if Madrid had held out for two and a half years, Barcelona would not merely hold out but would really become "the grave of Fascism." On the last day of the great preparations for defense, the Government plastered the city with the famous 1936 Madrid slogan "No Passaran!"

However the political and organizational framework of Barcelona was utterly unlike that of Madrid of 1936. At that time Stalin and Azana could only with difficulty control the masses. The Government had to pretend, for example, that it welcomed the stream of foreign volunteers who came to fight Fascism. Organized in International Brigades, these volunteers constituted the backbone of the vigorous physical and spiritual expression of the workers. But once the Government achieved a unified and coordinated control over the masses it separated the Brigades from the Army and began eliminating them from the country. In October 1938 "... at Geneva the League was suddenly told by Leftist Premier Juan Negrin that he will speed up and continue his recent evacuation of foreign volunteers from Leftist Spain until not a single member of the famed International Brigade remains." (*N.Y.T. Magazine,* Oct. 17, 1938)

As one of the precautions for a safe entry of Franco into Barcelona, the Government had eliminated these troublesome elements from the city: "The 'Lost Legion' of the foreign volunteers who formerly fought on the side of the Spanish Government were rushed from Barcelona toward the French border today." (*N.Y.T.* Jan. 25, 1939)

Some of these deceived revolutionary workers attempted to enlist in the Stalin-Azana Army as individuals but the officials of the Spanish "democracy" would not let them: "Several of these men (International Brigaders) said they had offered to re-enlist as individuals to help save Barcelona but that their offer had been turned down." (*Ib.* Jan. 26, 1939)

The scene was set for the major culminating act in the destruction of the Spanish Revolution. On January 26, 1939, only a few hours after the promise to defend Barcelona inch by inch, the shocking report was received from Spain that "Barcelona fell to Franco's encircling troops without a shot being fired within its gates." (*N.Y. Herald Tribune,* Jan. 27, 1939). "Barcelona Taken Without a Fight." (*N.Y.T.* Jan. 27, 1939)

Naturally, the Loyalist leaders had to present some excuses for openly turning Barcelona over to Franco. "It was explained that any attempt to hold the city would have risked isolation of some of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

best troops and most important war material." (*N.Y.H.T.* Jan. 27, 1939). This excuse was pretty raw, when one recalls that Barcelona was the mainspring of the Loyalist machine and that with this mainspring broken the victory of Franco was practically consummated. For what purpose, then, was the Government saving its war material and troops? The answer to this question came from Spain in short order, exposing the deceitful explanation. The Leftist leaders were not trying to save war material; they were turning it over to Franco as fast as they could. Two days after the excuse for the betrayal of Barcelona was made public, an American correspondent with the Fascist armies reported that "... victory over the Republicans in Catalonia is held all the more significant because of the vast stores of armaments, munitions and food they abandoned in their retreat from Barcelona." (*N.Y.T.* Jan. 29, 1939)

It is important to note that the Loyalist regime abandoned the war supplies not because its Army was routed but deliberately without even a token battle. The much-emphasized "defeat" was a sudden withdrawal of the key section of an undefeated, powerful military machine from a strongly defensible position. Instead of a policy of saving valuable stocks of arms the open tactic was to leave war equipment not only in Barcelona but all along the path of the Fascist troops: "In Barcelona as well as in subsequently captured towns General Franco's recuperation service continues to discover daily more stocks of abandoned war material." (*Ib.* Feb. 4, 1939)

A large part of the war supplies which the Government was purportedly bent on saving by giving Barcelona to Franco, was immediately turned over to the French Government: "That the Catalonian army did not lack the wherewithal to fight is indicated by large quantities of arms, including ninety field pieces of artillery, machine guns, trench mortars, anti-tank guns, rifles, revolvers, hand grenades and airplanes that have been surrendered to the French authorities by Loyalist soldiers who have crossed the border." (*Ib.* Feb. 8, 1939). The magnitude of the Government sabotage can be seen further: "According to reports to the French authorities, 200 freight cars standing on the tracks at Cerbere contain arms and munitions, which will be inspected by French experts before their transfer is permitted." (*Ib.*) This point is extremely illuminating. The capacity of 200 freight cars is enormous. Was this vast amount of war material shipped into Catalonia? Then obviously it had never been unloaded. And if these arms had come from the Catalonian war industry then the sabotaging intent behind the instructions to load them into cars, in the midst of outward preparations for defense, is clear.

But the best indication of the hypocrisy of the Stalinist-Loyalist explanations and of the policy of the Government was the tactic of dismembering its Air Force. In line with the Stalin-Azana policy, planes, whole squadrons of them, were turned over to France even some days after Barcelona: "At least sixty Loyalist fighting planes

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

today landed at French airports." (*N.Y. World Telegram,* Feb. 6, 1939)

The excuse that the abandonment of Barcelona was intended as a move to prevent the isolation of the best troops was an out and out lie. Loyalist Spain had already been divided into two segments, Catalonia in the Northeast isolated from Central Spain by the Government's "mysterious" withdrawal from Lower Catalonia. The only possible result of the Barcelona withdrawal could be and actually was the retreat of the best troops into France where they were disarmed and put in concentration camps.

As for the tens of thousands of revolutionary workers of the city, they were left behind like mice in a trap. The situation in January 1939 was totally different from that of July 1936. At that time, the workers, because they tore themselves loose from the Stalin-Azana Government grip, secured arms and defeated Franco's regulars and the mercenary Moors. In the 1939 Barcelona situation only those who had been recruited into the army possessed weapons, while the civilian workers were again unarmed. These workers no longer depended upon themselves to halt Franco, for they had been induced to rely wholly upon the regular troops. Under the military terrorist discipline the latter were like inanimate objects in the hands of the Socialist dictator Negrin. Ordered to leave Barcelona, the Army moved with mechanical precision, abandoning the civilian workers to their terrible fate. Bound by martial law, lulled into security by feverish, last-minute sham defense measures and above all by the hypocritical solemn assurance that "the city will be defended inch by inch, street by street, house by house," they were too dazed by the sudden withdrawal to offer any resistance, though arms and munitions, in immeasurably greater quantities than in 1936, were within easy reach. The Trotsky leaders, who incessantly beat the drums for "material aid" which by their interpretation was to serve in a way against the Fascist army, knew that "material aid" really never got to the civilian workers: "The workers themselves had no arms with which to resist: the arms which they had torn from the fascists on July 19, 1936 had been wrested from them, first by the Caballero government and then by the Negrin cabinet, under the slogan 'All arms to the front.' In concealing its plan to abandon the city without a fight the Loyalist government naturally could not give warning in time to thousands of workers-militants who are marked down in Franco's files for execution." (*New Int.* Feb. 1939, 38)

Thus, from all aspects, the policy of "material aid" to Spanish bourgeois democracy or, as Trotsky termed the policy, "aid to the Spanish Republican armies," was a contrivance to facilitate the triumph of Fascism.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

24. *The End in Spain; the Trotsky Confession*

Although a third of Spain with a population of more than eight million, with a considerable munitions industry and an Army of over a half million, still remained Loyalist, the wind up was rapid. The headquarters of the Government were temporarily set up at Figueras near the French border. On February 5 Azana withdrew to France and on February 27 he officially resigned. In the next few weeks Stalin and the Spanish bourgeois democracy performed the closing acts in paving the way for Fascism. On March 5, 1939 through a military revolt a National Council of Defense was set up in Madrid under the presidency of Miaja. It shed the last ideological trappings of "democracy" by ousting Negrin and his Cabinet, the vestige of the People's Front Government. The Stalin Rightist line in Spain was ended. What Stalin needed now was the usual Left cover. Hence, the outraged, bewildered advanced workers were led by their leaders in a "counter-revolt" throughout Loyalist Spain. *The Daily Worker* of March 9, 1939 disclosed the identity of the leadership in the hopeless Leftist spasm: "There were indications that Hernandez, a member of the Political Buro of the Spanish Communist Party, had played a prominent role in bringing about the counter-revolt."

Previously the official suppression had been directed against the POUMists, and the Left Anarchist and Socialist workers. The Miaja regime turned the fire against the Communist Party and crushed the Leftist uprising in Madrid, Albacete, Cuenca, Guadalajara and Muscia.

On March 28, the Miaja gang, representing the "Republic," ordered the white flag raised over Madrid and departed. In the afternoon Franco's troops, without opposition, marched into the capital of Spain. Next day the remaining Loyalist provincial capitals surrendered, and Franco informed the world of total victory.

Over a million workers and peasants slaughtered; more than a quarter of a million in Franco's dungeons; hundreds of thousands scattered as "Spanish refugees" in France and other countries, gradually perishing of starvation and disease; and a brutal terrorist regime in Spain—this is the cost in blood and suffering the Spanish masses paid for the combined conscious crime of the political enemies inside the ranks of the proletariat, the Anarchist, Socialist, and the Stalin and Trotsky burocrats.

Some time passed. The details of the bloody Spanish nightmare—the concrete evidence of the fact that bourgeois democracy paves the way for Fascism—somewhat faded in the memory of the Trotsky workers. Then the Cannon "revolutionary Marxists" printed two statements which appeared *in the same issue of their paper* and amounted to a full albeit inadvertent confession of their *consciously* perpetrated crime. One statement read "In that struggle, by the way, the revolutionary Marxists were in favor of giving material support to the Spanish Loyalists because we recognized it to be a struggle between fascism

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
'P_ACCEPT-

and capitalist democracy and between the two we prefer the latter." (*Militant,* May 24, 1941). In the other statement these Trotskyite assistants of Stalin and political assassins of the Spanish proletarian vanguard and militant peasants, with unsurpassed cynicism confessed: "To admit the truth would be to confess that bourgeois democracy is not opposite of fascism, but paves the way for fascism in this epoch of capitalist decay." (*Ib.*)

CHAPTER XXVIII.

TROTSKY'S END

1. *The Grim Man-Hunt*

UNSWERVINGLY aiding Stalin to stay in power, collaborating with Stalin politically in assassinating the proletarian vanguard, Trotsky, in consequence, was largely responsible for the system of individual assassinations conducted by Stalin. In the light of research, the basis for this system had been laid down early in 1923 through Trotsky's silence about Lenin's anti-Stalin policy consultation and his betrayal of Stalin's Georgian opponents. That the list of persons marked for assassination had to eventually include Trotsky himself is self-evident. "Already in 1924 Stalin was weighing in his mind the arguments pro and con on the question of my physical liquidation." (*Fourth Int.* June 1941, 152). Trotsky asserts he possessed definite information: "In the first weeks of our short-lived bloc (1926-1927) Zinoviev said to me 'Do you think that Stalin hasn't weighed the question of eliminating you physically? He has, and on more than one occasion.' " (*Ib.*)

Trotsky reported the words of advice from Kamenev who, with Zinoviev, feared that they might all meet with a Stalin-devised "accident": " 'The moment we broke with him, we drew up something in the nature of a testament, warning that in the event of our "accidental" deaths, the one person responsible for it would be Stalin. This document is being kept in a safe place. I advise you to do the same thing. You can expect anything from this Asiatic.' " (*Ib.*)

Why did Stalin delay the murder of Zinoviev, Kamenev and Trotsky? It was because, owing to the mechanics of burocratic centralism, he was compelled first to place them into the category of "oppositionists;" but, paradoxically, as "oppositionists," they had the backing of the anti-Stalin proletarian vanguard. The "accidental" death of any one of them would have been a pretty thin "mystery." Even the fairly "natural" case of Stalin's loyal supporter, Frunze, whose death from an operation cleared the way for Voroshilov to take over the post of War Commissar, caused occasional whispers. These whispers were given a literary form by one of the Bolshevik writers,

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

'a/5.0
ACCEPT-

Boris Pilnyak. "Pilnyak's troubles began with an audacious and somewhat gruesome prank. A story with a mysterious, and so far as mind can fathom it a totally irrelevant title *The Tale of an Unextinguished Moon,* describes how at the direction of the party executive a military commander was sent to the operating table, against his own will and against the advice of his physicians, and there died." (Eastman, *Artists in Uniform,* 110). For this hint Pilnyak was punished by Stalin. But Frunze, after all, was a Stalin "favorite." On the other hand, an "accidental" death of a high leader of the Opposition would have aroused more than mere whispers and might have had unforeseen consequences fraught with real danger for Stalin. According to Trotsky's record, Zinoviev made it plain that Stalin had considered the question of assassinating Trotsky; however, "He was deterred by one and the same consideration, namely, that the youth would place the responsibility upon the 'triumvirate' or upon him personally, and resort to terrorist acts. Stalin therefore considered it necessary to crush beforehand the cadres of the opposition youth." (*F. I.* June 1941, 152)

While Stalin was forced to bide his time, Trotsky, enmeshed in a web of Stalinist crimes from which there was no escape, was impelled to deliver the Opposition youth, at first piecemeal, then wholesale, to the GPU, and thus, oddly enough, deprive himself of his only shield.

Moving steadily toward his major prey, Stalin meanwhile instituted a series of assassinations of members of Trotsky's family and Trotsky's friends and secretaries. With refined cruelty the GPU drove one of his daughters to suicide, and, as with Trotsky's friend Joffe, brutally deprived his other daughter of medical treatment. Trotsky's son-in-law was shipped away to die in a Siberian prison. His son, Sergei, who had remained in the Soviet Union, was arrested and probably tortured to death.

The destruction of Trotsky's secretaries began early in the Stalinist period. "The gentle, modest Glazman had been driven to suicide as early as 1924." (*My Life,* II, 295). Another assistant and friend of Trotsky's, Butov, was tortured and left to die in a prison in the wake of his protest hunger strike.

In Spain where the Trotsky group had helped build the Comintern section, the GPU murdered his secretary Erwin Wolfe. In France, where Trotsky had bolstered the influence of the Stalin burocrats by advocating organic unity of the Socialist and Comintern organizations and through the advocacy of a Stalin-Socialist government, his son Leon Sedov, who had accompanied him into foreign exile, was poisoned, another of his secretaries, Rudolph Klement, mysteriously disappeared and shortly thereafter his hideously mutilated body was discovered floating in the Seine.

With great regularity Stalin was wiping out one by one the people nearest and dearest to Trotsky, each new murder bringing closer the doom of Trotsky himself.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

There must have been many a time when Trotsky rued the assurance he had given Kamenev: "I am against liquidating Stalin." He was now reaping the crop he had sown.

Trotsky was keenly alive to the danger of assassination. After his arrival abroad he led a life of self-imprisonment and kept an armed guard, imagining he could thus protect himself. "My guard has existed since the day of my exile to Turkey, i.e. almost 12 Years."

There could have been no better warning to Trotsky than the Moscow Trials whereby Stalin destroyed most of the architects of his system of personal power—Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Rykov and thousands of lesser burocrats. Of all of Stalin's early associates in the usurpatory crime only one remained living, the biggest figure of them all—*Trotsky!* In that chain of destruction Trotsky was the sole missing link.

2. *Stalin's Machine-Gun Assassins*

During the Moscow Trials Trotsky came to Mexico. His home in Coyocan was transformed into a fortress, with armed guards on duty day and night. An alarm system was installed and many other defense measures were taken. Outside the fortress in a sentry-house were stationed special police detailed by the Mexican Government. Yet Trotsky, who knew that the GPU had its eye upon him, never felt safe.

At the beginning of 1940 Trotsky inferred on certain strong grounds that Stalin had given the signal. (*Fourth Int.* Nov. 1940, 151)

The preliminary grounds for the assassination had been laid long in advance. A GPU agent "Jacson" was designated to make connections with the Trotskyites in Paris. The connecting thread led him to New York. Finally, representing himself as an ardent admirer, he was admitted to the Trotsky household in Mexico.

On May 24, 1940 at dawn "Jacson" and a sizable band of heavily armed assassins, disguised as policemen, subdued the Mexican police on duty. Trotsky's guard, who never suspected Jascon, opened the door, was overpowered, and the assassins filed inside Trotsky's fort. They divided into groups, one gang opened a furious fusillade through Trotsky's bedroom door while the other held off his guards with a hail of bullets. Wakened by the first shots, Trotsky and his wife rolled to the floor and escaped the fire. The assassins departed, taking the tricked guard with them to prevent the exposure of Jacson.

Thus, Trotsky's fort proved no forbidden rampart to the GPU. From that day he conceived the blunt, bitter truth that his doom was irrevocably sealed. The only unknown factor was the precise method and time the GPU would choose to strike again.

3. *Trotsky's Mental Archives and the Assassination*

As we have seen, Trotsky was niggardly in divulging both the contents of his precious documentary archives and the unwritten records of burocratic crimes stored in his mind. Most of the revelations

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that did come from his pen were made under the goad of Stalin's relentless pressure. Trotsky's intellect always warned him not to talk too much. But each new turn of the thumbscrew engendered an impulsion to talk, to make known something of the frightful story of Stalin's rise to power and in that manner to exact some satisfaction for all the tortures Stalin was inflicting upon him. The cumulative weight was overhwelming. The Moscow Trials, the destruction of his friends, his children, his secretaries, the May 24 terror, the murder of the kidnapped guard Sheldon Hart, the absolute certainty of future attempts to assassinate him so inflamed him that he *really* began to talk! It was a few weeks after the May 24 machine-gun terror that he dispatched to *Liberty* his article describing that diabolic February 1923 session of the Trio and himself at which they dealt with Stalin's proposal to "send" poison to Lenin. When Trotsky viewed the article in print he must have experienced a mixed feeling of malicious satisfaction and anxiety, for he had overstepped the limits he had set for himself.

Stalin realized the need of the finale. Trotsky must not be permitted to produce any more of such testimony. It was published in August, and in that month, on the 20th, Jacson arrived in the Trotsky fortress to complete his assignment. Jacson had written an "article" and asked Trotsky for opinion and suggestions. Trotsky and the assassin entered the study together, and there, while Trotsky was sitting at his desk scrutinizing the "manuscript," Jacson with a pickaxe, which he had kept concealed under his coat, struck the mortal blow.

4. *Trotsky, Browder and the GPU*

The mechanism of the GPU on foreign soil had been familiar to Trotsky: "The general scheme of the GPU organization abroad is the following: *in the Central Committee of each section of the Comintern there is placed a responsible director of the GPU for that counry.* His status is known only to the secretary of the party and one or two trustworthy members." (*F. I.* Oct. 1940, 138)

It may be assumed with certainty that Trotsky and his lieutenants had made an inquiry into the whereabouts of the directing center of the far-flung sructure of the GPU in North America. They apparently concluded that it was located in New York City. "We can picture the scene in GPU headquarters in New York" wrote Joseph Hanson, Trotsky's secretary "when Jacson returned to make his report following the failure of the May 24 assault: 'Go back and finish the job yourself; or—'" (121)

At the time of the assassination the general secretary of the United States' section of the Comintern was Earl Browder, who, according to Trotsky's own description of Stalin's system of political police, was closely linked with the GPU. Lest there be doubt that Trotsky specifically had Browder in mind as working hand in glove with the GPU in New York we cite Trotsky's letter to the Attorney General

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Mexico, to the chief of the federal police and to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, written after the May 24 attempt: "The whole mechanism was discovered in France and Switzerland in connection with the murder of Reiss and the later moves against my dead son and other persons. As for the United States, Krivitsky established that the sister of Browder, general secretary of the party, became a GPU agent through her brother's recommendation. This example proves the rule rather than the exception." (138)

The only conclusion possible is that the Trotsky leaders were convinced that Browder lent the necessary aid to the GPU headquarters in New York both in the May 24 attempt and in the final atack which ended Trosky's life.

5. *Trotsky's Last Will and Testament: Support Browder!*

Some months after the assassination, in a speech outlining the policies of the Trotsky Party in the United States, Cannon made an inadvertent admission. During his last visit to Trotsky, Cannon had discussed with his chief the question of winning over Stalinist workers. Trotsky advanced a line from which even Cannon recoiled: "Trotsky posed the question on the issue of the election campaign and put forward a *shocking* proposal." (*S.A.* Oct. 19, 1940). Of course the proposal was wrapped in the usual diplomatic and "critical" language. Cannon quoted Trotsky's own words: " 'We must find a way to reach these workers as they are, with their present mentality. Let us take up the leaders at their word and state: if the Communis Party will maintain the position of real opposition to imperialist war we will propose to them a united front, and even give critical support to their candidates in the election.' " (*Ib.*). So thoroughly was Trotsky imbued with the necessity of continuing to tie the workers to the Stalinist burocracy that even when he was in the GPU's dark shadow of death, he instructed his lieutenants to give political assistance to the Browder crew.

In making public Trotsky's line of support to his own assassins, Cannon pretended that the proposal had shocked his sensibilities. He had to do some fast and clever talking to cover up this rawest expression of Trotsky's Stalinist politics and to clear himself in the eyes of his astounded audience: "Nobody in the delegation agreed with the Old Man on this drastic proposal. We had a long and at times heated discussion with him on it."

Whether Trotsky's loyal disciples actually argued against putting out their Stalinist line in all its brazen nakedness is not certain. At all events, by reporting disagreement with Trotsky on the issue of open support to Browder, Cannon was able to carry out the essence of that proposal through support to various cloaked stooges of Browder. Such was the case, for illustration, the Trotskyite support to the Browder-controlled American Labor Pary. "Many well-meaning people are horrified at the idea that we are supporting a Stalinist-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

nist party

controlled party," they wrote in their paper on March 15, 1941. And going a step further they defiantly declared: "we can even whisper to our critics that if we deemed it advisable and of benefit to our party and conseqently to the working class we would not hesitate to give critical support to *Browder* running on the Communist party ticket."

Summarized briefly, Trotsky's political heirs have been carrying on the work of their chief of forging a broad variety of links to chain the proletarian vanguard to the Kremlin.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MARXISM AND THE BOLSHEVIK STATE

Workers Democratic World Government

VERSUS

National-Burocratic 'Soviet' and Capitalist Regimes

VOLUME TWO

Lenin's Burocratism and Russian Nationalism

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I.

BUROCRATISM IN THE FIRST STAGE OF THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

1. *Lenin's Testimony*

UP TO THIS period we have investigated the development of Stalin's power since Lenin's exit from power and from life, and the basic political methods of the Stalin-controlled Comintern. However, to broaden the understanding of the Stalinist development it is necessary to examine its background and the political and organizational soil from which it grew. It is important to determine whether the Bolshevik Party leadership was burocratic at the time Stalin was placed in the powerful post of General Secretary of the Central Commitee. Lenin in a historically priceless all-encompassing statement at the Eleventh Congress of the Party on March 27, 1922, though parenthetic in form shed clear light on this subject: "After all, we have not ceased to be revolutionaries (although many say, not altogether without foundation, that we have become burocratized.)" (*S.W.* IX, 336)

Lenin's statement was heard by all high leaders at the Congress. They evidently accepted his evaluation as a fact, for not one of them offered any comment. Lenin's remark represented no sudden realization that came to him while he was on the speaker's platform but indicates that the matter of burocratism of the leadership had been brought up before. Moreover, "We have become burocratized"—did not mean that everybody had become burocratized except Lenin. It could mean every leader of the Party.

If the Party leadership was burocratic, it is plain that the State apparatus which this leadership controlled was also burocratic. Indeed, in the light of Lenin's own evaluation, by its very nature his apparatus could not be proletarian-democratic. Despite the pre-October declarations of Lenin, Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders that they would replace the old State structure with "a truly democratic apparatus of Soviets," the apparatus which they now wielded was, according to Lenin himself, in a large measure the very same administrative machine originally wielded by the former ruling classes of Russia: "With the exception of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, our state apparatus is very largely a survival of the old one, and has least of all undergone serious change. It has only been slightly repainted on the surface, but in all other things it is a typical relic of our old state apparatus." (382)

Evidently after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the collapse of the capitalist instrument of administration, the Bolshevik leadership collected the fragments, glued them together and gave the "new" apparatus a coat of Red paint.

This evaluation of Lenin's found emphatic reiteration in his

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

various other documents. "We took over the old State apparatus" he declared at the Fourth Congress of the Comintern on November 13, 1922. (X, 330). And in January 1923 in the article "On Cooperation" he wrote: "Two main tasks confront us which constitute the epoch: the first is to reconstruct our apparatus, which is utterly useless, and which we took over in its entirety from the preceding epoch." (IX, 408). No Bolshevik leader ever took issue with Lenin on this point. Trotsky publicly referred to Lenin's statement that the Soviet apparatus was the old, repainted Tsarist apparatus, and agreed with Lenin's analysis. Radek in 1921 openly acknowledged that the Soviet State was not the State the Bolshevik leaders had blueprinted in 1917: "Much rottenness has accumulated in our Soviet State. It does not correspond to that concept which we had when we began building the Soviet power." (*Pravda,* April 16, 1921)

Thus, according to Lenin and others, five years after the revolution, the Bolshevik leaders were burocrats, and the State apparatus under their sway was largely the same State apparatus wielded by Nikolai Romanov, Emperor and Autocrat of all Russias.

At what point did burocratization, this permanent feature of the Soviet State, begin? Zinoviev stated in *Pravda* of December 14, 1920: "The danger of burocratism was evident from the very first steps of the proletarian revolution." The investigation must, therefore, dig down to the very first days of the Bolshevik State.

2. *The Authentic Soviet Government*

On November 7, 1917—October 25 Old Style—the majority of the Russian proletariat and peasantry was won over to the Bolshevik program which promised *All Power to the Soviets.* Lenin explained with rare clarity that the slogan "Power to the Soviets means a radical change in the entire old state apparatus, in that burocratic apparatus which hampers everything democratic; it means removing this apparatus and substituting for it a new popular one, i.e. a truly democratic apparatus of Soviets, the organized and armed majority of the people, the workers, the soldiers, the peasants; it means allowing the majority of the people initiative and independence not only in the selection of deputies, but also in the management of the state, in the realization of reform and social changes." ("One of the Fundamental Questions," *Rabochy Put,* Sept. 27, 1917: *C.W.* XXI, Bk. I, 166)

The workers, soldiers and sailors, led by the Trotsky-directed Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet overthrew the Kerensky government. During the overthrow there convened in Smolny Institute the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Its delegates had been elected on the basis of the widest proletarian democracy yet witnessed. Not only did they represent the masses but they were actually of the masses: "The majority of them were people without big names, but who had proved themselves in action and won lasting confidence in their own localities. From the active army it was almost

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

exclusively rank-and-file soldiers who had run the blockade of army committees and headquarters and come here as delegates. A majority of them had begun to live a political life with the revolution. They had been formed by an experience of eight months. They knew little, but knew it well." So Trotsky in his *History of the Russian Revolution* describes the delegates to the Second Congress of Soviets (III, 302). "The outward appearance of the Congress proclaimed its make-up. The officers' chevrons, the eye-glasses and neckties of intellectuals to be seen at the first Congress had almost completely disappeared. A grey color prevailed uninterruptedly, in costumes and in faces. All had worn out their clothes during the war... The plebeian nation had for the first time sent up an honest representation made in its own image and not retouched." (*Ib.*)

The Bolshevik slogan, *All Power to the Soviets,* actually materialized. The Second Congress assumed power and issued a proclamation containing this statement: "Supported by an overwhelming majority of the workers, soldiers and peasants, and basing itself on the victorious insurrection of the workers and the garrison of Petrograd, the Congress hereby resolves to take governmental power into its own hands." (*Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers and Soldiers Deputies,* R. 93)

The Congress adopted the Decrees on Peace, Land and on the formation of the Council of People's Commissars. Then it elected a new Central Executive Committee with a Bolshevik majority to replace the one formed by the First All-Russian Congress in July 1917 which had been composed in its majority of Mensheviks and SRs. Upon the conclusion of these acts the Congress adjourned.

3. *The Sovnarkom*

According to the pre-October theoretical documents and popular agitation of the Bolsheviks, power was to be vested *exclusively* in the hands of the Soviets or the Congress of the Soviets. Not a word had been said foreshadowing some other instrument of government. Lenin had previously stated plainly enough "We regard the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, elected by all the workers and the soldiers, as the only revolutionary government possible." (*Pravda,* April 28, 1917; *C.W.* XX, Bk 1, 186). In an article "Our Views" Lenin had asserted: "Power must reside solely in the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants' and other Deputies." (224). In an "Open Letter to the Peasant Deputies" Lenin had emphatically declared: "We aim at a republic in which the whole power of the state, from top to bottom, belongs exclusively and entirely to the Soviets of Workers' Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies." (XX, Bk II, 59)

Lenin at one time even proposed "To declare the Soviet of Workers' Deputies in Moscow as the provisional government of Russia..." (XXI, Bk II, 65). He advocated the placing of the Central

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

State power into the hands of "a Congress of Soviets." (XX, Bk I, 169)

But immediately after the seizure of power, or, more correctly, in the process of that seizure, when the concrete moment arrived to put their pre-October slogan "All-Power to the Soviets" into practice, the Bolshevik leaders did not recognize the Congress of Soviets as the established Soviet government but, while the Congress was meeting, proceeded to create an entirely different instrument of power, never foreshadowed in the Bolshevik agitation or program. Trotsky records: "During that day, the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks was at work in Smolny. It was deciding the problem of the new government of Russia. No minutes were kept—or they have not been preserved. Nobody was bothering about future historians, although a lot of trouble was being prepared for them right there. The evening session of the Congress was to create a cabinet of ministers. M-i-n-i-s-t-e-r-s? What a sadly compromised word! It stinks of the high burocratic career, the crowning of some parliamentary ambition. It was decided to call the government the Soviet of Peoples Commissars: that at least had a fresher sound." (*H. of R.R.* III, 322)

This newly conceived instrument of power (Sovnarkom) would have had no validity in the eyes of the masses without the sanction of the authentic Soviet Government, the Congress of Soviets. Accordingly the Bolshevik leaders drew up an appropriate decree and submitted it to the Congress. The document read in part: "By decree of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets a Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government, to be known as the Soviets of People's Commissars, is formed to govern the country until the meeting of the Constitutional Assembly." (*Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers* and *Soldiers Deputies,* R. 79)

The Bolshevik leaders simultaneously presented a list of names for various posts in the Sovnarkom. They made no move to open nominations on the floor of the Congress or to discuss the fitness of each proposed person for the respective post of power. They had decided among themselves which post each of them would take and brought the decision to the Congress for nominal approval. The enthusiastic Bolshevik delegates, because of their infinite confidence in the wisdom and integrity of the leaders, acclaimed virtually every step the leaders took and sanctioned the decree and the slate by an overwhelming majority.

However, the fact that an administrative device was introduced which had never before been discussed, or indicated, or even hinted at in the pre-October program of the Bolshevik Party, did not pass unnoticed. One of those who took note was a Baltic Fleet sailor, Yarchuk, a Left Anarchist who supported the Bolsheviks. "In Kronstadt Yarchuk was a prominent figure... Prior to October Revolution I did not know of any occasion where Yarchuk would clash with the Bolsheviks... when Yarchuk took the floor we had nothing to worry

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

about—Yarchuk completely sided with our agitational declarations." (Flerovsky, *Proletarskaya Revolutsia,* 1926, VII, 61). "I was interested in Yarchuk. Much depended upon him. Because of his popularity he could have caused big trouble and it would have been difficult (perhaps impossible) to overcome him." (64). The Bolshevik fraction of the Kronstadt Soviet had chosen Yarchuk as one of its two delegates to the Congress. The reason for that choice was described by the Bolshevik Flerovsky, the other delegate: "On the 23 of October elections for delegates to the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets were conducted at a session of the Kronstadt Soviet. Two were elected: The Anarchist Yarchuk and I. These elections reflected perfectly the sentiment of the Soviet and of Kronstadt. The approach of the revolution was felt by all, the organizing role of the Bolshevik Party in this revolution was clear and apparent to everybody. For this reason my candidacy was supported almost unanimously. The second candidate could be either an SR or a Maximalist. Both of these tendencies entered candidates but hardly collected the votes of their own fractions. The anarcho-syndicalist Yarchuk received a considerable majority. He received the vote of our fraction, of a portion of the SRs and of the Maximalists. Our vote for Yarchuk was determined by the need to have at the Congress a politically-resolute man capable of following us to the end without wavering. Yarchuk was such a man." (*Ib.* Oct. 1922, X. 134)

Before attending the Congress Flerovsky and Yarchuk had performed a very important role in the overthrow of the Kerensky regime. They were made members of the Kronstadt Revolutionary Staff of five, organized by the Kronstadt Soviet to defend the Congress of Soviets (136). This staff directed the naval operations of the cruiser Aurora against the Winter Palace which sheltered the Kerensky Cabinet. (139-144). Following the capture of the Winter Palace, Flerovsky and Yarchuk went to Smolny as Delegates to the Congress.

Flerovsky in his recollections records Yarchuk's astonishment and resentment at the creation of the Sovnarkom. It meant to Yarchuk that the Congress of Soviets, which had assumed *all* power in accord with the previous demands of the Bolshevik leaders, would now be deprived of this power by these very leaders. "My neighbour Yarchuk is in great excitement. 'What sort of a Soviet of Commissars? What kind of an invention is that? All Power to the Soviets!' Here on the spot there develops a hot dispute." (146)

Yarchuk, and probably many others—for it would be preposterous to suppose that he alone of the tens of millions of supporters of the slogan All Power to the Soviets rebelled against the idea of establishing a Cabinet regime—regarded himself as having been deceived by the Revolution which he had just helped to accomplish. Now he regarded the Bolshevik Flerovsky and every other Bolshevik as "usurpers." Flerovsky tells of Yarchuk's and his own return to their ship: "Aboard the ship there were long arguments. Yarchuk was furious,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was indignant and regarded himself deceived. Is it nice to be deceived by the revolution! At length, having peacefully eaten he fell asleep without undressing together with the 'usurper!'" (146)

Yarchuk had accepted the nomination as a delegate of Kronstadt Soviet and had been elected on the understanding that he would support the transfer of power to the Congress of the Soviets. "The election was fortified with a specific *imperative* resolution: 'The Congress must remove the Kerensky Government and *take power* into its own hands.'" (134)

Before he participated in the seizure of power Yarchuk had full confidence in the Bolshevik leadership regarding the pledge of establishing the Congress as *the* organ of power. When he arrived in Smolny after he had aided to overthrow the bourgeois regime he stood firm for the Bolshevik proposition as registered before the seizure of power in the *imperative* resolution of the Kronstadt Soviet. The Bolshevik leaders, however, during the seizure of power brought before the Congress a new and different proposition. Yarchuk felt betrayed.

Yarchuk was not bound by any party discipline. He was responsible only to the Kronstadt Soviet and its resolution. Flerovsky, on the other hand, was a disciplined Bolshevik Party member. His unbounded faith in the leadership caused him to accept the creation of the Sovnarkom without much thinking; he thereby violated the will of the Kronstadt Soviet and his own mandate.

Naturally neither Yarchuk nor the others engaged in the controversy on this point grasped the full significance of the Bolshevik leaders' invention. The Second Congress of Soviets was composed of delegates chosen from local Soviets all over Russia, the mechanics of the entire structure being mass-democratic elections from the bottom upward. The Sovnarkom, on the other hand, was brought in from outside the actual Soviet structure and represented a move of the Bolshevik Party leadership from above.

A significant milestone in the development of the Bolshevik leaders as State burocrats is the fact that not only was the idea of creating a governing council of the highest party leaders never submitted to the masses, or to the Soviets, it was not even presented to the membership of the Bolshevik Party for a democratic discussion and vote.

No two supreme organs of power can coexist in one State. Either the Congress of Soviets, comprised of the duly elected representatives of the masses, was to continue sitting in full sessions as the Soviet Government, issuing decrees, formulating policies and building around itself the administrative structure of the new regime—in short, exercising the authority bestowed upon it by the Revolution—or it was to ratify the creation of a new instrument of State authority, the Sovnarkom, and thus, in effect, abdicate.

The Congress followed the latter course and relinquished its supreme authority to the newly-invented instrument of power. Divested

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of governmental function, it no longer had any place in the scheme of building power; in consequence it accepted the motion of adjournment introduced by the Bolshevik leadership.

In full harmony with the pre-October slogans of the Bolshevik Party, the Delegates to the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets had possessed the right bestowed on them by the Soviets of the entire country to take their place as the collective wielders of State power. Trotsky indicates that on the eve of the seizure of power he inserted this very meaning in his address to the Delegates " 'If you stand firm, there will be no civil war, our enemies will capitulate at once, and you will take the place that belongs to you by right.' " (*My Life*, II, 44)

When Trotsky said the Delegates would take the place belonging to them by right, it could hardly be interpreted to mean that after wielding power for a few hours they would take their place in their respective homes. Having guided the masses in the seizure of power he together with the rest of the Bolshevik leaders sent away the Delegates, whom the workers, soldiers and sailors through their Soviets had invested with governmental power, into oblivion.

For a fuller understanding of the power that was born during the October Revolution it is important to bring out the vital fact that although the movement was guided by the Bolshevik Party, the overthrow of the Kerensky regime was carried out not in the name of the Party but in the name of the Soviets. This was because the masses on the basis of the Bolshevik agitation had come to the realization that the only institution that could wield power democratically, and therefore in their interests, was the Soviets. As Trotsky pointed out in his *History of the Russian Revolution*, "What the people were waiting for was that the Soviets should show them when and how to carry out the program of the Bolsheviks." (III 282). Any attempt at insurrection in the name of the Bolshevik party itself would have resulted in disastrous consequences. "Attempts to lead the insurrection directly through the party nowhere produced results." (283)

Trotsky cites Bolshevik reports describing the last minutes sentiment of the masses before the seizure of power: "According to the report of ensign Berzin, at an October military conference of the Bolsheviks in Moscow the delegates were saying: 'It is hard to know whether the troops will come out at the summons of the Moscow committee of the Bolsheviks. At the summons of the Soviet they might all come out.' Nevertheless even in September the Moscow garrison had voted 90 per cent Bolshevik." (282-3)

The center of Bolshevik influence was of course Petrograd. But even here the workers and soldiers oriented themselves almost exclusively to the Petrograd Soviet. "At a Petrograd Garrison Conference on the 18th, delegates reported that their regiments were awaiting the summons of the Soviet to come out. Nobody mentioned the party, notwithstanding that the Bolsheviks stood at the head of many units.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Thus unity in the barracks could be preserved only by uniting the sympathetic, the wavering, and the semi-hostile under the discipline of the Soviet. The Grenadier regiment even declared that it would come out only at the command of the Congress of Soviets." (283)

On the eve of the overthrow of the bourgeois regime the idea that the forthcoming Soviet Congress would be set up as *the* Government permeated the mind of the masses of Petrograd. The Petrograd garrison, without whose support any attempt to seize power would have been a bloody fiasco, distinctly stated in its resolution: "The All-Russian Congress of Soviets must take the power into its own hands."

Had the Bolshevik leaders told the workers, soldiers and sailors that the Congress of Soviets would be in power only a few hours and that a Council of Commissars would suddenly be formed by the Bolshevik Central Committee to take over the power *from the Congress,* there would have been no October Revolution. Not only the Yarchuks but even many workers and soldiers recruited into the Bolshevik Party would have turned their back upon the Bolshevik leaders.

It must be remembered that resolutions such as the one passed by the Petrograd garrison were inspired and in most instances drawn up by the Bolsheviks themselves. By creating the Cabinet government, therefore, the Bolshevik leaders voided not only their own previous declarations but also the decision of the workers and soldiers to establish the Congress of Soviets as *the* Soviet Government.

The Bolshevik workers were led to regard the Sovnarkom as a material realization of the pre-October slogan All Power to the Soviets. However the mass feeling for the abolished true Soviet Government lingered on. It was this atmosphere that prompted the Sovnarkom to lean for a while on the shade of the authority of that defunct body. In issuing decrees the Sovnarkom had to remind the masses of the source of its power. "In the name of the Government of the Republic chosen by the All-Russian Congress of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies with the participation of the Peasants' Deputies, the Soviet of People's Commissars decrees:" (*Izvestia,* Nov. 10, 1917). In its order to General Dukhonin to open armistice negotiations with Germany, the Sovnarkom said: "In accordance with instructions from the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Soviet of People's Commissars has assumed the authority..." (a Sovnarkom radiogram, Nov. 21, 1917). People's Commissar of War, Krylenko, addressing the Russian soldiers, spoke of "the government of the Soviet of People's Commissars created by the All-Russian Congress of Soviets." (*Izvestia,* Nov. 28, 1917)

To recapitulate: the process of the seizure and the shift of power went through three stages:

1). The Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet directs the uprising on the basis of the express understanding that the Congress of Soviets is to assume the role of government, fulfilling the slogan *All Power to the Soviets.*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2). Power is taken by the Petrograd Soviet and immediately turned over to the All-Soviet Congress which becomes *the* Soviet Government and functions as such in accord with the mandate by the masses.

3). Even while the Congress of Soviets is sitting as *the* Government, the Bolshevik leaders meet and decide that an instrument of government must be set up to supplant the Congress. They originate the Sovnarkom. The decision is not submitted *for a discussion* either to the Soviet Congress or to the Bolshevik Party membership.

4). Through their powerful influence over the majority of the Delegates, the Bolshevik leaders induce the Congress to turn over the power to the Sovnarkom and abolish itself as the Soviet Government.

It will be edifying to note the difference in the political nature of the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets and the Second, the difference in the duration of the two Congresses and the attitude of the Parties dominating them. The First, directed by the Mensheviks and SRs, was used as a prop to the bourgeois regime. They propagandized against the Bolshevik line which stated that the Soviets were historically a form through which the masses could wield power. Yet they took advantage of this institution and kept the First Congress in session for nearly three weeks, holding numerous sittings in the interests of the bourgeoisie. The Second Congress, guided by the Bolsheviks, though pledged by them to be *the* Government, and though declared to be the highest organ of proletarian power, held only two sittings and was dismissed in about 48 hours.

4. *Stalin's Decree No. 12*

Although the Bolshevik leaders had induced the Congress to agree to the establishment of a Cabinet rule, the Congress never granted legislative powers to the Sovnarkom which was declared to be only a "Provisional Government." However no sooner had the delegates of the Second Congress departed than the Sovnarkom, overstepping the bounds set by the Congress, not only exceeded its authority in removing and appointing members in its own body but it arrogated to itself *legislative* powers!

Surprising as it may sound, some of the first laws of the Sovnarkom, published under Lenin's signature, were not even submitted to the Sovnarkom itself and were not drafted by Lenin. The law-maker was Stalin who collaborated in this work with two other Bolshevik leaders, Larin and Kamenev. Stalin must have sensed that the issuing of laws in the name of the Sovnarkom constituted a transgression of the legal limits set by the Soviet. Consequently, to legalize the next step in the usurpation of power, Stalin, Kamenev and Larin, without bothering to get the approval of the Sovnarkom and in complete burocratic disregard of the Executive Committee of the Soviet, drafted a decree known as Decree No. 12 which was issued on November 12, 1917, one week after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. The open-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ing paragraph of the decree read: "From now on until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly the preparation and drafting of laws shall be carried out by the Provisional Government of Workers and Peasants elected by the All-Russian Congress of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies in the order set forth in the present regulations." (*Collection of Decrees and Orders of the Workers and Peasants Government*, R. No. 1, 10)

By issuing this decree, Stalin and his associates put the stamp of legality on their own violation of the law set by the Congress of Soviets.

Lenin evidently did not contemplate the arrogant lengths to which Stalin, Kamenev and Larin would go, for he was amazed when he read their decree. "I remember Lenin's astonishment when he first saw . . ." wrote Larin in *Narodnoye Khoziaistvo* of November 1918, "the decree No. 12, under his signature, which conferred legislative powers on the Sovnarkom (the Congress of Soviets granted only executive powers) . . ."

But apparently Lenin's astonishment wore off, for he took no steps to have Decree No. 12 rescinded; he thereby sanctioned another undemocratic action of the Bolshevik leadership.

An argument on the question of the usurpatory tendency manifested by the heads of the Provisional Sovnarkom arose between the Bolshevik leaders and the Left SRs who had 29 representatives in the Soviet Executive Committee which numbered 101 members. They submitted an official protest to Lenin, the Chairman of the Sovnarkom:

"At the Second Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies it was established that the Central Executive Committee was to be the highest organ to which the Government was to be fully responsible. Yet during the last days a number of decrees have been published (in the name of the Government) without any discussion and sanction by the Central Executive Committee. In the same way the Government adopted measures factually abolishing the fundamentals of civil liberties." (Cited in Lenin's *C.W.* XV, R. 27)

Lenin's reply to the charge of undemocratic actions was brief. "The new power in its activity could not bother considering all the obstacles which would arise in its path while strictly observing all the formalities." (*Ib.*) He thus defended the burocratic procedure of the Sovnarkom. Finally, to settle the argument, the arrogation of the privilege to the Sovnarkom to issue decrees without submitting them to the Soviet Executive (C.E.C.) was legalized in a resolution drawn up by Trotsky in the Soviet Executive Committee. The adoption of this resolution was assured by the Bolshevik majority. The most important paragraph read: "The Soviet Parliament cannot deny the Soviet of People's Commissars the right to issue decrees of immediate necessity in the spirit of the general program of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets without first submitting them to the C.E.C." On the question of control over the Sovnarkom the resolution stated: "The C.E.C. has general control over all acts of the Soviet of People's Commissars with

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the power to recall the Government or any member of it." (Trotsky, III, Bk 2, 108-9)

On the surface it would seem that this part of Trotsky's resolution re-established the C.E.C. in its original rights. But the fact was that the same Bolshevik leaders acted on different committees and the mechanics of Government was therefore reduced to a series of meaningless formalities wherein selfsame persons checked and controlled themselves. Opponents of the Bolsheviks were quick to catch the amusing aspect of this procedure. Especially biting was the sarcasm in the columns of Gorky's paper: "In one room Lenin and Trotsky act in the capacity of People's Commissars. In the next room they are the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets." (*Novaya Zhizn*, Nov. 27, 1917)

The Bolshevik masses turned a deaf ear to all the criticism aimed at Lenin and Trotsky. They had a compelling reason for not trusting Gorky, because he had opposed the overthrow of Kerensky, and for not counting on the judgement of the Left SRs who, after all, were not proletarian-revolutionists. Lenin and Trotsky were names producing almost a magic effect among the workers. Such men as Lenin and Trotsky could not go astray in their glorious task of remodelling society—so thought the Bolshevik workers.

5. *The Appointment System*

Prior to October, Lenin had reiterated on many occasions that in the future Soviet Republic "All officials and all and every kind of deputy must be subject not only to election, but also to recall at any time." (*S.W.* VI, 81). However, this thesis, which had formed a part of the Bolshevik program and had aided in spreading Bolshevik influence, was also put aside. The Sovnarkom began appointing officials and soon the practice grew into a system. The framework of this reality as opposed to the pre-October blueprints affected the entire leading stratum of the Party. Many eager members, some consumed with the desire to work for the proletariat, others perhaps already having in the back of their mind the embryonic idea of economic security held out by the prospect of administrative jobs, flocked around the People's Commissars who handed out appointments in all directions of the State compass.

Some witness accounts are of priceless historical value. An enterprising intellectual, Pestkovsky, having failed to get a job at Trotsky's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs, at length found himself in a room where Commissar Menzhinsky sat on a sofa over which hung a sign "The People's Commissariat of Finance." Menzhinsky himself had never been elected to the post of Commissar of Finance. By appointment he supplanted Skvortsov, a man originally approved by the Second Congress of Soviets on the Sovnarkom slate. "I sat down near Menzhinsky and began a conversation. With the most innocent air he started to question me about my earlier career and evinced curiosity

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

regarding my past training. I replied, among other things, that I had studied at the London University where, among various subjects, I had studied finances. Menzhinsky suddenly arose, fixed his eyes upon me and categorically declared: In that case we shall make you the director of the State Bank." (*Proletarskaya Revoliutsia,* No. 10, Oct. 1922, 100). On the 27 of November 1917 *Izvestia* carried the following announcement: "Stanislav Pestkovsky is hereby appointed Director of the State Bank."

However, Pestkovsky's career as Director of the State Bank lasted less than a week. He was removed and in his place was appointed Osinsky. "Having finished with the 'finance' career I again commenced looking around for a place to 'attach' myself." (*P.R.* No. 10, 100)

Pestkovsky reexamined his qualifications and concluded that his knowledge of languages could be applied in Stalin's Commissariat of Nationalities. But Stalin had set up no office as yet, so Pestkovsky asked for a mandate giving him the authority to set up a Commissariat for Stalin. Furnished with a mandate, Pestkovsky prowled through the Smolny in search of a convenient spot to set up Stalin's Commissariat. He found a room occupied by the Commission of Supplies of the Red Guard and decided to settle there. At the same time he induced Senuta, a functionary of that Commission and an old comrade of his, to go over to Stalin's Commissariat. " 'What are you doing here?' I asked. 'Working on Supply to the Red Guard,' 'Come over to us, into the People's Commissariat of Nationalities.' 'All right.' " (*Ib.* 102)

Pestkovsky, whom Stalin appointed Secretary of the People's Commissariat of Nationalities (Narkomnats) immediately appointed Senuta his subordinate as "Manager of the Office of Narkomnats" (*Ib.*). Years later, Pestkovsky, a loyal Stalinist, was appointed Soviet envoy to Mexico.

Another Bolshevik, Schlichter, tells about his appointment to the post of Commissar of Agriculture. After a conversation, Lenin informed him: " 'Your appointment to the post of Commissar of Agriculture will be confirmed at the nearest session of the Sovnarkom.' " And indicating that there could be absolutely no doubt that the appointment was assured, Lenin added: " 'It would be well if you at once occupied yourself with the reception of the peasant delegates from the localities.' " (*Ib.* No. 8, 1922, 171)

Thus, the system of appointments flourished from the very moment the proletariat did away with the Russian bourgeois order. One could read in the official Bolshevik press almost daily:

> "Appointments
> "Stanislav Yanovic Babinsky is appointed second assistant Commissar of Polish affairs.
> Signed: People's Commissar of Nationalities
> Djugashvili—Stalin" (*Pravda,* Dec. 20, 1917)
> "Citizen Litvinov is hereby appointed temporary representative

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

delegate of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs in London."

(*Gazeta Vremenogo Raboche-Krestianskogo Pravitelstva,* Dec. 24, 1917).

This appointment was signed by Trotsky. Most frequently, appointments were made by the Chairman of the Sovnarkom: "Moisey Solomonovich Uritsky is appointed Commisar of All-Russian Commission of the Affairs of Election to the Constituent Assembly, with the privilege of removing members of this Commission, appointing new ones, and generally applying measures for assuring the correct procedure in the preparatory work for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly. Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars V. Ulianov (Lenin)." (*Leninsky Sbornik,* XVIII, 41-2)

"December 19, 1917 (Jan. 1, 1918). Comrade Sergei Ordjonikidze is appointed temporary Extraordinary Commissar of the district of the Ukraine." (XXXV, 10)

Four years after October, Lenin, addressing the Political Educational Department, told his listeners that they should manage to work outside governmental offices. "Excuse me for saying so, but I do not think you should be appointed to any office; you should fulfill your tasks as plain citizens. When you are appointed to some office you become burocratized." (*S.W.* IX, 272). But Lenin failed to add that while those who were appointed to some office became burocratized, the people who were wielding the power of appointment were already State burocrats.

Although appointments were often credited with the name "elected", this crediting was falling off as the train of power continued on the burocratic track. The habitual daily exercise of the power of appointment imperceptibly shaped the ideological mold of the Bolshevik leadership. The word "appoint" was slowly ingrained into their mind. It crept into every field of activity, often side by side with the word "elect," but gradually supplanting that term which in 1917 before October formed the cornerstone of Lenin's agitational-programmatic line on how to build proletarian power.

In the field of education the appointive system was introduced almost immediately after the October revolution. In a decree of November 29, 1917, issued by the Commissariat of Education, the formation of the Commission of People's Education was arranged on the basis of members partly elected and partly appointed from above —the proportion was: Twelve elected but "fifteen by appointment from the Sovnarkom."

Later with the approach of the Stalinist period, the "elections" among themselves the high leaders frankly termed as "appointments." Stalin, for example, was secretly chosen General Secretary by the Central Committee during the Tenth Congress of the Party. When Lenin wrote his Testament he said "*appoint*" another man in Stalin's place.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

6. *The Sovnarkom's Growing Burocratic Power*

Prior to the October Revolution, in a vigorous appeal addressed to the wide masses, Lenin had stirringly defended the democratic right of provincial governing bodies and denounced with equal emphasis any attempts on the part of the Kerensky government to appoint "commissars" over localities. In May 1917 Lenin received a telegram from the Yeniseisk Soviet. He promptly published the telegram which said: "We protest against the intention of the government again to introduce a burocracy; we declare: first, that we will not brook any appointed officers to rule us; second, that the officials driven out by the peasants cannot be returned; third, that we recognize only those local organs that have been created in Yeniseisk County by the people themselves; fourth, that appointed officers can rule here only over our dead bodies." (*Pravda*, May 11, 1917). In his comments Lenin gave full support to the authors of the telegram: "The Yeniseisk Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is a thousand times right, both practically and in the matter of principle." (*Ib. C.W.* XX, Bk. II, 17)

Lenin apparently felt so deeply about this principled question that in his "Draft Revision of Theoretical, Political and Other Sections of the Program" (May 1917), he inserted the following point: "The abolition of all local and provincial authorities appointed by the State."

Never in the history of political struggles was there a more democratic and truly proletarian principle than the one cited by Lenin in 1917 on the question of local self-government built on a proletarian democratic foundation. Less than a month before the October Revolution Lenin repeated the basic idea of that principle: "In the localities, where democratically elected institutions still do not exist, and in the army, the power must be transferred exclusively to the local Soviets and to commissars elected by them, and to other exclusively elective institutions." ("The Aims of the Revolution," *S.W.* VI, 243-4)

These were excellent democratic words. But when Lenin and Trotsky created the Sovnarkom they deviated from the line advocated the day before the seizure of power. On January 7, 1918 the Sovnarkom issued a decree in which the most striking point read: "As a temporary measure commissars may be *appointed* in those provinces where the power of the Soviet is not sufficiently well established or where the Soviet Government is not exclusively recognised . . ." (Our emph.—G.S.). Had Lenin said *permanent* instead of temporary measure, he would have been far closer to fact. The system of appointments was extended in scope, curtailing the local power of the Soviets and laying the groundwork for burocratic centralism which with the passing years grew to monstrous proportions. The great democratic principle which Lenin defended so valiantly in his writings of 1917 was not applied in life. The position against appointments he inserted in

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his "Draft Revision of the Programme" in 1917 was omitted in the Party Program adopted in March 1919.

The Third Congress of Soviets, meeting in January 1918, played no role in the question of power. Its work consisted of passing resolutions approving the acts of the Sovnarkom. At this Congress the adjective "Provisional" was dropped and the Sovnarkom was understood to remain a permanent government. No one thought of changing the personnel of the ruling nucleus of the Sovnarkom and thus preventing the danger of its burocratic ossification. There was no stipulated term of office. Neither the leadership of the Party nor the delegates at the Congress made any provision to prevent permanent occupation of any post by any one person. The violation of the Bolshevik declared line of 1917 of absolute adherence to the elective method and the impermissibility of a system of appointments was not even discussed.

The Congress passed over in silence the fact that certain people were retained in posts of power who, after a revealing experience shortly after October, would have hardly been considered by revolutionary workers qualified to hold responsible posts in the Government or in the Soviets. These were Zinoviev, Kamenev, Lunacharsky, Nogin and others. They had deserted, while the workers were fighting to smash the class enemies. Shaken by the verbal barrage of the Mensheviks and S.R.s who took exception to the October revolution, unnerved by the slower tempo of the mass movement in the provinces, these Bolshevik leaders showered their resignations on the Central Committee. The keynote they set was collaboration with the Menshevik and S.R. supporters of Russian imperialism: "Long live the Government of all Soviet Parties! Immediate conciliation on this basis!"

The Bolshevik masses bitterly resented the action of these Bolshevik leaders. John Reed describes the reception accorded to one of them: "Scarcely had the meeting formally opened before Nogin was assailed with a tempest of jeers and angry shouts. In vain he tried to argue, to explain; they would not listen. He had left the Council of People's Commissars, he had deserted his post while the battle was raging." (*Ten Days That Shook the World,* 253)

In a message to all the workers of Russia, Lenin castigated those leaders: "The comrades who have left us have acted like deserters, since they not only quitted the posts entrusted to them, but violated the direct decision of the Central Committee of our Party, which enjoined them to delay their resignation at least until a decision be taken by the Petrograd and Moscow Party organizations." (*S.W.* VI, 414-415)

Lenin singled out Zinoviev and Kamenev for especial condemnatory remarks: "Remember, comrades, that two of the deserters, Kamenev and Zinoviev, acted as deserters and strike-breakers even before the insurrection in Petrograd." (415)

It is highly improbable that the Bolshevik workers would have placed these leaders back in their posts of power; rather they would

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

have elected people who had shown firmness and stability in critical situations.

But the matters were finally adjusted at the top level of the Bolshevik Party. The rapid spread of the October revolution eliminated the sense of insecurity among these leaders. The workers, who had vented their disgust and indignation, were not given the opportunity by means of vote to voice their view on retaining these people in power. Afterward, through the pressure of the burocratic lever, Zinoviev manipulated to get himself "elected" as head of the Petrograd Soviet and Kamenev as head of the Moscow Soviet.

Thus, in the first few months, during the so-called Smolny Period of the Revolution, the Bolshevik Government was already a burocratized apparatus, and the opponents gloated over this fact. Wrote Gorky's paper: "The collective organization of the commissariat, as was originally projected, remains on paper. Factually the commissariats became fully burocratized institutions of the type of former ministries." (*Novaya Zhizn,* Feb. 17, 1918)

Yet in those early months of the Sovnarkom power, with the Russian bourgeoisie in collapse and the masses in a large measure directly seizing control of shops and landlord estates, no worker could have detected the direction of the development. The Sovnarkom was molded to a workers' background, the atmosphere in Smolny was comradely, unpretentious, Lenin and other leaders evincing painstaking attention to and friendly consideration for the most modest worker or peasant calling at the Sovnarkom. A. Shlichter, writing his reminiscences five years later, described the Smolny atmosphere of the first weeks of the October Revolution:

"But for that, how much joy and pleasure this simplicity of surroundings left in the soul of a worker who was coming into Smolny on various business to 'his' Workers' government. Here for him everything was his own,—everything so close and familiar. This feeling was experienced especially by a worker and peasant when they were in touch with the Sovnarkom office, with that room which directly led into the cabinet of Lenin." (*Proletarskaya Revolutsia,* No. 8, 1922, 170). "I assume that those days comprised the period of the greatest spiritual closeness and confidence of the peasant masses toward the Soviet power in general and to the Sovnarkom especially." (173) But this spiritual closeness of the masses to the Sovnarkom diminished, as the citation implies, and eventually disappeared entirely.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER II.

THE OFFICIAL BREAK WITH THE PRE-OCTOBER AVOWALS ON THE PARIS COMMUNE

1. *The Kremlin Atmosphere*

On March 12, 1918 the Sovnarkom left Petrograd for Moscow and made the Kremlin the seat of government. The transfer was motivated by the need of insuring the safety of the Sovnarkom and Petrograd. "The temptation to seize the revolutionary capital and the government with one swift blow could not but appeal strongly to both Germany and the Allies. To seize a starving Petrograd without the government would be quite a different matter." (*My Life, II, 78*). On the other hand, Trotsky admits that, "The transfer of the Central power to Moscow was, of course, a blow to Petrograd. There was great, almost general opposition to the transfer . . ." (73-4) The Sovnarkom disregarded the general attitude of the Bolshevik Party membership in the matter and carried out its burocratic will. The political reason for delivering a blow to Petrograd went much deeper than the physical safety of the city and the Government. Petrograd was the cradle of the revolution, the revolutionary capital, as Trotsky said, and in March 1918 was still a turbulent proletarian center. Moscow was a quieter place. It had deep nationalist roots leading back to the Twelfth Century; it was known as the Holy City of Holy Russia. Smolny represented the memorable symbol of the authority of the Petrograd Soviet and of the Second Congress of Soviets, the authentic Soviet Government. The Kremlin was both geographically and ideologically far removed from Smolny. Nothing less suitable from the proletarian point of view could be desired as a seat of a true democratic workers' administration than the Kremlin. An old fortress on a hill, enclosed by a high battlement wall, surmounted with towers, containing churches, cathedrals, chapels, monasteries, numerous relics of saints, the throne of Vladimir and monuments of ancient Russia, the Kremlin was the blackest symbol of Russian monarchist reaction. This ponderous relic of barbarism was in part a public museum before the revolution. And there, behind the imposing wall, in the shadow of the palace of Ivan the Terrible, of the great white palace of the emperors of Russia, of the residence of the metropolitans of Moscow, and of the Archangel Cathedral which contains the tombs of the early Tsars, settled the Sovnarkom.

Had the Sovnarkom established itself in some spacious office building, of which Moscow had many, it is only reasonable to conclude that streams of workers and peasants would have been converging on the Sovnarkom as they had in Petrograd. But there were no streams of workers and peasants flowing into the Kremlin. The gates of the Kremlin were opened only to people on official business. The Kremlin

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

wall became not only a physical but also a psychological barrier between the masses and the Sovnarkom.

We have cited Lenin's statement that the State apparatus which he and other leaders controlled was largely the old Tsarist apparatus. A minute particle of that old mechanism was the Kremlin household administration which the Sovnarkom took over intact. Trotsky tells some of his experiences in the Kremlin:

"Among the countless Kremlin flunkeys and other servants of all sorts were many old people who had waited on several emperors. . . . At dinner we were given thin cabbage soup and unpolished buckwheat, served on palace plates adorned with eagles. 'What is he doing? Look!' whispered Seryozha to his mother. The old man moved like a shadow behind the chairs and turned the plates this way or that. Seryozha was the first to guess: the double-headed eagle on the rim of the plate must face the guest." (*My Life,* II, 77)

In exile abroad, the families of Russian revolutionists attempted to live cooperatively, and those who lived apart from the emigree colonies took care of domestic duties themselves. After the October Revolution one would have expected the Sovnarkom to set up a communal kitchen and dining room. One would have thought that a comradely atmosphere would have been close to the hearts of the men of the Sovnarkom. But no, they apparently preferred the flunkeydom of the imperial autocrats, with the dry, dead routine of obsequious deference taught by decades of groveling servility.

The Kremlin atmosphere was, of course, not a cause of the buroc ratization. But it could be hardly regarded as conducive to the leaders' mental health.

2. *The Policy of One-Man Dictatorship*

Among the far-reaching acts of the Sovnarkom after it had established itself in the Kremlin was the issuance of a decree (March 26, 1918) placing the management of the railways under the control of individuals. This was a sharp departure not only from the position of 1917 but even from the line mapped out two months after the seizure of power. Whereas on January 23, 1918 the Sovnarkom had provided for *elected* administrative organs chosen in the Soviet of Railwaymen's Deputies, the decree of March 26 marked the beginning of the era of *individual dictators* in the vast economic mechanism of the Bolshevik State. The crucial point of the new decree instructed each center to *appoint* a worker with the knowledge of the railroad business; he was to be made chief executive of the specific railway center; and finally, "Within a given traffic division this official is vested with full dictatorial powers. The appointment of such a person shall be endorsed by the People's Commissars of Ways of Communications."

This "one-man-dictatorship" decree produced a stunning effect upon many Bolshevik workers and even some leaders in Russia and sympathizers abroad. A Bolshevik faction calling itself "Left Com-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

munists" attacked Lenin's course as a violation of proletarian democratic principles and as a definite trend toward burocratization of power. On April 4, 1918 the Left Communist, headed by Bukharin and counting among their numerous supporters a number of leading members of the Party, submitted to the Party Central Committee, guided by Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev, a criticism in which they showed remarkable foresight. Condemning Lenin's course they predicted where it would lead:

"The form of State organization will develop in the direction of burocratic centralism, domination of various commissars, deprivation of the local Soviets of their independence and the factual rejection of the type of 'State Commune' ruled from below. Numerous facts show that there is already developing a definite tendency in that direction. (Railroad decree, articles by Latzis, etc.)." (*Kommunist* No. 1, April 20, 1918; Lenin, *Works,* R. XXII; *Sämtliche Werke,* XXII)

Though many statements in the Theses of the Left Communists were erroneous, the above passage was prophetic. The practices of the Sovnarkom inexorably led toward greater and greater burocratic centralism—the condition foreshadowed by the Left Communists.

Lenin was as hard as steel in defending the line of individual dictators. Speaking at the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets on April 29, 1918 he categorically declared: "The Railroad Decree, comrades, is a step which indicates that we have emerged onto the highway." (*C.W.* XV, R. 250)

Lenin insisted that only by means of a one-man dictatorship could the industrial structure be organized: "You know that our Railroad Decree, with all its errors, which we are ready to correct, has embraced the substance of the requirement: it rests on that mass of workers who are true to the most stern discipline, who must be unified by a one-man power which the Soviets appoint and which the Soviets remove, and demand during work absolute obedience in the process, when it is necessary that heavy industry work like a machine and thousands of people be directed by only one will and obey the orders of a single Soviet leader." (*Ib.*)

The new line was in violent conflict with everything Lenin had preached in 1917. He now ridiculed and assailed those who questioned his innovation. "But if there are vacillating people, confused, with a petty-bourgeois outlook, who have been frightened by one-man power, who become hysterical and do not go along with us, then why are they like that?" And Lenin concluded the point with the following peculiar logic: "In order not to indulge in useless argument, we say: when dealing with a concrete question, approach it concretely." (*Ib.*)

To the revolutionary workers, who were greatly impressed by Lenin's political generalship in the pre-October days, all the objections to his one-man-dictator line seemed nonsensical and disruptive. Of great weight in shaping the mood of the Party to favor the one-man dictator policy was the momentous fact that the organizer of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the October Insurrection, Leon Trotsky, gave his unconditional support to Lenin's new line.

3. *The Corrupting Pay to State Officials*

With the introduction of the policy of one-man dictators, the Sovnarkom set up a system through which the administrative power was distributed among the individual leaders of the Bolshevik Party. These leaders drew the former Tsarist officials into the service of the State and placed the direction of production to a large extent in the hands of former factory owners, industrial managers and technicians under limited control of the factory committees.

The method Lenin used to employ these "bourgeois specialists" constituted another departure from the original 1917 Bolshevik platform. The new line was embodied in Lenin's pamphlet known abroad as "Soviets at Work," the Russian title being "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government."

It will be well to place Lenin's 1917 propaganda on the method of employing officials and technicians side by side with his new program. For this purpose there is no more suitable 1917 document than *State and Revolution* in which Lenin held up the practices of the Paris Commune as a precedent and an already proved working model for the building of an administrative body of the proletarian State. In that document Lenin indicated that democratic measures, including a very important policy on remuneration of all servants of the State, constituted *the bridge* to Socialism! "All officials, without exception, elected and subject to recall *at any time,* their salaries reduced to the level of 'workmen's wages'—these simple and 'self-evident' democratic measures, while completely uniting the interests of the workers and the majority of the peasants, at the same time serve as the bridge between capitalism and socialism." (*S.W.* VII, 42). Lenin contended that paying State employees an average wage is a question of high importance. His repeated references to this point placed it prominently among the top programmatic positions of 1917. When he, while writing the pamphlet, received information that some of the Bolsheviks proposed a higher than average skilled workers' pay to State officials, he inserted a footnote condemning their stand as an "unpardonable error." (71). Any attempt to tamper with this principle, said Lenin, was a crime against the working class. Lenin appraised proletarian democratic measures as guarantees against the corrupting effect of power, as a protection for the workers. In words of Engels quoted by Lenin in the pamphlet, the proletariat must " 'safeguard itself against its own deputies and officials.' " (*Ib.*)

Lenin knew that a break with these principles would open the path to the transformation of the proletarian officials into burocratic rulers over the masses. The sombre examples of the feudal and capitalist state mechanisms despotically exacting oriental servility from its subordinates were a grim warning to the revolutionary workers. The experience of the Commune, Lenin said, was one of the paramount

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lessons in proletarian democracy. Castigating the foreign Social Democracy and the Russian Mensheviks as betrayers of the principle of proletarian democracy Lenin again and again cited passages from the analytical writings of Marx and Engels to convince the workers that only the Bolshevik Party upheld the proletarian-democratic principles and therefore represented the authentic policy of safeguarding the masses against the conversion of the State administrative organs into an oppressive machine of burocratized officials. There were two distinct remedies to counteract the tendency toward such a negative outcome of the proletarian revolution. Lenin quoted Engels: " 'Against the transformation of the state and the organs of the state from servants of society into masters of society—an inevitable transformation in all previous states—the Commune made use of two infallible expedients. In the first place it filled all posts—administrative, judicial and educational—by election on the basis of universal suffrage of all concerned, with the right of the same electors to recall their delegate at any time. And, in the second place, all officials, high or low, were paid only the wages received by other workers. The highest salary paid by the Commune to anyone was 6,000 francs. In this way, an effective barrier to place-hunting and careerism was set up, even apart from the binding mandates to delegates to representative bodies which were also added in profusion." (*Ib.*) A remarkably profound conclusion of Lenin's regarding consistent democracy is contained in a single sentence immediately following the citation: "Engels here approaches the interesting boundary line at which consistent democracy is *transformed* into socialism and at which it *demands* socialism." (*Ib.*)

We have seen that on the day after the October Insurrection there developed a contrast between the doctrine on consistent proletarian democracy and the burocratic practice of the Sovnarkom. The ensuing acts, such as the Railroad Decree creating individual dictators, were not in the category of building a bridge to Socialism as programmatically expounded by Lenin in *State and Revolution.*

In his April 1918 pamphlet "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" Lenin discussed the problem of enlisting bourgeois technicians and specialists into the services of the Bolshevik State. It goes without saying that it is a must for the proletariat to draw the bourgeois specialists into the work. The question at issue is: what method to employ? Lenin discussed the two distinct methods: "The vast majority of the saboteurs are 'coming into our service,' but the best organizers and the biggest specialists can be utilized by the State either in the old way, in the bourgeois way (i.e. for high salaries), or in the new way, in the proletarian way (i.e., by creating the conditions of national accounting and control from below, which would inevitably and automatically subordinate the specialists and enlist them for our work.)" (322)

One would naturally conclude, after viewing Lenin's program of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1917 and his denunciation of the Mensheviks and Kautsky for breaking with the principles of the Commune, that Lenin's choice could be no other than the proletarian method. This conclusion would be an error, for Lenin had a surprise in store for those who awaited the concrete application of his 1917 writings. He officially and explicitly rejected the proletarian method:

"Now we have had to resort to the old *bourgeois* method and to agree to pay a very high price for the 'services' of the biggest bourgeois specialists. All those who are familiar with the subject appreciate this, but not all ponder over the significance of the measure that has been adopted by the proletarian state. Clearly, such a measure is a compromise, a departure from the principles of the Paris Commune and of every proletarian state, which call for the reduction of all salaries to the level of the wages of the average worker, which calls for a struggle against careerism, not in words, but in deeds." (*Ib.*). Thus, Lenin consciously, and as the future proved, irrevocably, broke with the ideas he himself had expounded in 1917 on building the proletarian-democratic power.

All the clear, fighting words of 1917 against opportunism, corruption, against high-salaried privileges and careerism were just forgotten words. Lenin *consciously* introduced an *opposite* policy, one which inevitably would promote corruption among the State functionaries and in the proletarian midst. Of this, too, he made a public admission:

"The corrupting influence of high salaries upon the Soviet government (the more so that the rapidity with which the revolution occurred could not but attract a certain number of adventurers and rogues who, together with a number of untalented or dishonest commissars, would very much like to become 'star' embezzlers of state funds) and upon the masses of the workers is indisputable." (324)

Lenin wrote that the bribery of the bourgeois specialists, a "tribute" he called it, was but a temporary measure which might be liquidated within a year: "If the class conscious advanced workers and poor peasants manage with the aid of the Soviet institutions to organize, become disciplined, to pull themselves up, to create strong labor discipline in the course of one year, then in a year's time we shall throw off this 'tribute,' which can be reduced even before that" (325). As history proved, Lenin introduced a *system*, not a temporary "tribute", and as months and years rolled on, the "tribute" was actually increased, reaching "perfection" under Stalin's personal dictatorship.

In his April 1918 pamphlet "Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Goverment" Lenin examined once again the question of individual dictators, centering his attack on the Left SRs:

"The struggle that is developing around the recent decree on the management of the railways, the decree which grants individual leaders dictatorial power (or 'unlimited' powers) is characteristic. The conscious representatives of petty-bourgeois laxity (in all probability

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

most of them are unconscious representatives) would like to see in this granting of 'unlimited' (i.e., dictatorial) powers to individual persons a departure from the collegium principle, from democracy and from other principles of Soviet Government. Here and there, among Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, a positively hooligan agitation, i.e., agitation appealing to bad instincts and to the small proprietor's striving to 'grab all he can,' has been developed against the dictatorship decree. The question has become one of really enormous significance: first, the question of principle, viz., is the appointment of individual persons, dictators with unlimited powers, in general compatible with the fundamental principles of Soviet Government?" (340-1)

Neither in 1917 nor ever before did anyone in the labor movement propose that after the revolution the workers submit to a system of individual dictators. If in 1917 somebody had had the brazenness to make such a proposal, Lenin would have been the first aroused against it. He would have spoken along the familiar 1917 line: Is such an undemocratic method compatible with the bourgeois system? Without a doubt. But not with *proletarian* society! A rigorous personal dictator in bourgeois society is often needed in order for the system to survive. The workers, on the other hand, must maintain a system of genuine democratic procedure or they are off the track which leads to emancipation. Individual dictators in proletarian society automatically eliminate workers democracy and therefore act against the interest of the class.

Lenin in 1917 would have warned the proletariat against the undemocratic system of personal dictators and would have advised to consult the histories of the individual dictators to show that in *every case* they were reactionary because of the very nature of a personal dictatorship.

But Lenin's argument, quite obviously, underwent an amazing change once he had assumed power. Disregarding all his previous assertions about the impermissibility of appointments from above, about the principle of guarding against State officials becoming transformed from servants into masters of society, Lenin now said: "Hence, there is absolutely no contradiction in principle between Soviet (i.e., Socialist) democracy and the exercise of dictatorial powers by individual persons." (341-2)

Casting overboard his democratic words of 1917 Lenin developed a new and totally different line of a bridge to Socialism: "The revolution has only just broken the oldest, most durable and heaviest fetters to which the masses were compelled to submit. That was yesterday. But today the same revolution demands, in the interests of Socialism, that the masses *unquestioningly obey the single will of* the leaders of the labor process." (342. Lenin's emphasis)

Gorky's paper gave a striking picture of the Sovnarkom regime, and though the description was hostile in tone, many Bolshevik work-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ers, with pain and bitterness, could not help seeing that it closely approximated the true state of affairs:

"The spirit of compromise, of possibilism has begun to penetrate all the pores and branches of Soviet activity. Liquidation of the old principles posed the question of attracting new social elements to perform positive work. Preserving as a compensation the revolutionary 'phrase' and political terror, the Soviet of Commissars has come forth with such projects in the economic and financial field as to be the indubitable capitulation of the Leninist 'October.' At the same time entire important branches of State administration and social construction have passed unto the management of persons who have nothing in common with the former Leninist course." (*N.Z.* April 21, No. 73, 1918). "Let the Zinovievs, Volodarskys and others infected with the itch of revolutionary phrase shout about the unalterable fidelity of the Soviet of People's Commissars to the October principles. Both Lenin and Bukharin know that this is not so." (Apr. 28, No. 79, 1918)

The enemies of the proletarian revolution watched with keen interest the deviation from the 1917 line and the rising opposition to the burocratic policies of the Lenin-Trotsky leadership inside the Bolshevik Party. They indicated that there were internal voices raised against Lenin's abandonment of the 1917 Bolshevik program which had been branded by all opponents of Bolshevism as utopian. Sukhanov wrote in Gorky's paper:

"But the Left S.R. opposition is a trifle as compared with the growth of the Left opposition in the Bolshevik ranks themselves. It was possible without difficulty to overcome the war 'itch' of Bukharin but it is far worse when the loyal Kollontai starts a mutiny 'in the name of redeeming the great slogans of the October days,' in order 'not to allow them to be stained with concessions in the direction of compromisist policy.' " (Apr. 21, No. 73, 1918)

Alexandra Kollontai was an outstanding figure. She was among the very few people who during the World War, when even people like Trotsky refused to side with the Bolsheviks and continued his collaboration with Left Mensevism, broke with the Mensheviks and joined Lenin (January 1915). Lenin's first written reaction to the reports of the overthrow of the Tzarist regime was addressed to her. Having worked in Europe and America organizing the revolutionary elements on the Platform of Lenin's Zimmerwald Left, Kollontai returned to Russia and in August 1917 was arrested by the Kerensky government on frame-up charges of being a paid agent of the Kaiser. While in prison she was elected to the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party at the Sixth Party Congress, receiving a greater vote than Stalin, Bukharin, Rykov, Joffe and many others. The October Revolution was guided by that Central Committee. She was Commissar of Social Welfare in the Sovnarkom but was later removed. She became an adherent of the Left Communists.

The writers of *Novaya Zhizn* naturally used every manifestation

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of opposition to the Lenin-Trotsky regime as an argument in favor of bourgeois democracy—something against which Kollontai had fought most brilliantly in 1917 and which she rejected now as she had then.

Later, when the dictatorship of individuals reached a high degree of burocratic consolidation and a demand was raised in the Bolshevik Party to put an end to the dictatorship of persons, Lenin replied on March 31, 1920:

"We are now being dragged back to the question which was decided long ago, the question which the All-Russian Central Executive Committee confirmed and explained, namely that the Soviet Socialist democracy is in no way inconsistent with a one person rule and dictatorship, that the will of a class may at times be realized by a dictator who sometimes will accomplish more by himself and who is frequently indispensable." (*C.W.* XVII, R. 89; *S.W.* VIII, 222)

Having repudiated the proletarian method of building the new power and having adopted the bourgeois method, Lenin could not but accelerate the concentration of power in a group of personal dictators and eventually in the hands of a single dictator who realized not the will of the masses but of his own—against the interest of the masses.

4. *Reconstructing the Tsarist Burocratic Apparatus*

The Sovnarkom's policy of picking up the fragments of the half-smashed Tsarist administrative apparatus and cementing them together was described by Lenin: "We dispersed these old burocratic elements, shook them up and then began to place them in new posts. The Tsarist burocrats began to enter the Soviet institutions and practice their burocratic methods, they began to assume the coloring of Communists and, for greater success in their careers, to procure membership cards of the Russian Communist Party. And so, having been thrown out of the door, they fly in through the window!" (*S.W.* VIII, 353)

The last sentence in the above passage contradicts the first. Lenin should have said; We have thrown them out the window, then opened the door for them, invited them to come in and told everybody: "They must be surrounded by an atmosphere of comradely collaboration, by workers' commissars and by Communist nuclei." (*Ib.* 350). Moreover, although these Tzarist burocrats, the most privileged section of the population in the Romanov Empire, had been provided with excellent conditions in bourgeois society "they must be given the opportunity of working in better conditions than was the case under capitalism . . ." (*Ib.*)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER III.

LENIN'S BREST-LITOVSK POLICY

1. *Samples of Lenin's Pre-October Pledges on Peace*

WE HAVE seen that from the moment they seized power the Bolshevik leaders began breaking with the 1917 positions, principles and pledges on the basis of which they had won the support of the masses. We shall now examine Lenin's pre-October declarations on the question of peace and the line he followed after he established the Sovnarkom.

When the imperialist war of 1914 broke out, Lenin formulated the foreign peace policy for the Bolshevik Party in power: "The question as to what the party of the proletariat would do if the revolution placed power in its hands in the present war, we answer thus: We would offer peace to *all* the belligerents on the basis of freeing the colonies and *all* the dependent and oppressed peoples deprived of full rights. Under the present governments, neither Germany nor England nor France would accept it. If so, we would have to prepare and conduct a revolutionary war." (*C.W.* XVIII, 358)

With the fall of the Tsarist regime Lenin perceived that the Russian proletariat, approaching the task of seizing power, would at the same time be confronted with the problem of struggle against the world bourgeoisie. Outlining a peace program for a Soviet government Lenin in a letter from Zurich clearly stated: "For the enforcement of such conditions of peace the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, in my opinion, would agree to wage war against any bourgeois government and against all bourgeois governments of the world." (*C.W.* XX, Bk. I, 61)

Seeing that the Russian masses under the influence of the Mensheviks and SRs were intoxicated with a bourgeois-patriotic spirit of defensism, Lenin declared in his famous April Thesis:

"The class conscious proletariat can consent to a revolutionary war which would really justify revolutionary defencism only on condition: a) that power passes into the hands of the proletariat and its ally the poorest sections of the peasantry; b) that all annexations be renounced in deed, not in words." (*C.W.* XIV, Pt. I, R. 17; *C.W.* XX, B I, 106; *S.W.* VI, 21)

Throughout 1917 Lenin thundered against *all* imperialist powers, rejected peace with all and every capitalist government starting with the Russian. The Bolsheviks were indignant at the rumor that Lenin aimed to conclude a separate peace with the German imperialists. Branding this rumor as slander, Lenin inserted a statement in the resolution of the Petrograd Conference of the Bolshevik Party: "The conference reiterates its protests against the base slander circulated by the capitalists against our party to the effect that we are in favor of a

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

separate peace with Germany." (*C.W.* XX, Bk I, 212). In another of his replies to this accusation Lenin declared: "When they say that we want a separate peace, it is untrue. We say: no separate peace with any capitalists, and first of all with the Russian capitalists." (B. II, 214). This position was basic in the Bolshevik platform of 1917, and the Party leadership and membership without a single known exception firmly supported it.

Trotsky, while still outside the Bolshevik Party, stood on an identical platform. "None of us is for a separate peace." he declared at the First Congress of Soviets. (III, Pt. I, R. 107). When the Bolsheviks set up a Commissariat of Foreign Affairs they realized that it was an act totally at variance with the revolutionary letter and spirit of the pre-October Bolshevik propaganda. According to Trotsky's testimony, even Lenin was dubious: "What foreign affairs will we have now?" (*My Life,* II, R. 63). People came to Trotsky offering their services. "One of them later gave, in his memoirs, a fairly juicy account of my conversation with him soon after the Soviet government was formed. 'What diplomatic work are we to have?' I said according to his account. 'I will issue a few revolutionary proclamations to the peoples and then shut up shop.'" (64). This, of course, refers to Pestkovsky, who records approximately the same conversation: "'Mine is a small task,' Trotsky said, 'to publish the secret treaties and shut up shop.'" (*Proletarskaya Revolutsia,* No. 10, 1922, 99)

But how immeasurably distant were Trotsky's ideas at that time from those he developed, say, in 1920, when in an interview with John Reed he asserted: "Not only can we live with bourgeois governments but we can work together with them within very broad limits." (Trotsky, *Wks.* II, Pt II, R. 283)

2. *The Armistice*

"Let the German capitalist bandits together with their crowned murderer Wilhelm know that we will enter into no negotiations with them." (Lenin, "Is There a Road to a Just Peace?" *Pravda,* June 20, 1917; *C.W.* XX, B. II, 224). This statement of Lenin's was read and approved by millions of workers, peasants and soldiers prior to the October Revolution. Lenin's position seemed unequivocal. No conference, no parleys, no discussions with imperialism. What was there to discuss with the predatory ruling gangs which were drenching Europe in blood to satisfy their territorial and financial greed? Peace could not be secured from these criminal powers; it had to be imposed upon them by the revolutionary masses. "The terrible war must be terminated as soon as possible—not by a separate peace with Germany but by a general peace, not by a peace conducted by the capitalists—but by one forced on the capitalists by the working masses." (Lenin, "Open Letter to the Peasant Deputies." May 1917)

On the very day of the seizure of power, however, Lenin in presenting to the Second Congress of Soviets his Decree on Peace, which

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
_ACCEPT-

was addressed, factually, to the belligerent governments, injected a note "slightly" out of tune with all the previous Bolshevik declarations on peace without annexations and indemnities. He said: "We will consider also every other proposal." Did this, seemingly tactical but in reality new programmatic line, pass unnoticed? Not entirely. John Reed records: "An individual member claimed the floor. 'There is contradiction here,' he said. 'First you offer peace without annexations and indemnities, and then you say you will consider all peace offers. To consider means to accept.'" (*Ten Days,* 131). That individual member correctly sensed the deviation from the revolutionary pledge *no annexations and no indemnities.*

The Second Congress of Soviets issued an appeal for peace. Both the Allied and the Central Powers ignored the appeal. There was nothing else for a proletarian leadership to do but to prepare a revolutionary war against imperialism, as Lenin had said he would, once the Bolshevik Party were in power. In April 1917 in a Resolution on War Lenin had written for the Petrograd Conference of the Bolshevik Party he stated:

"Moreover, as editors of the central organ of our Party, and in the name of the Party, the above-named comrades had declared (*Social-Democrat,* Geneva, October 13, 1915, No. 47), that our Party, if it were placed in power while the war was still raging, would forthwith propose to Germany, as well as to all the other peoples, an open, non-oppressive, i.e., democratic peace, and that we, in case the German, English, French, and other capitalists declined such a peace, would ourselves start a revolutionary war, summoning the workers of all countries to join us. The Conference ratifies this declaration in full." (*C.W.* XX B. I, 213)

Now, instead of proclaiming a revolutionary war, or at least of laying down the policy of making preparations for such a struggle against the world capitalist order, the Bolshevik regime repeated the offer of "peace" on November 21, 1917 in a note to the Allied envoys in Petrograd. Simultaneously, Lenin, as President of the Sovnarkom, Trotsky, in his capacity of Commissar of Foreign Affairs, and Krylenko, Commissar of War, ordered General Dukhonin, Kerensky's Commander in Chief whom they had retained, "to address yourself to the military authorties of the enemy armies with the proposal of immediate cessation of hostilities for the purpose of starting peace negotiations."

The order constituted a sharp and complete break with the recent rigidly formulated policy of no negotiations with "the crowned murderer Wilhelm." The request to a Tsarist general to open negotiations with the German imperialists was a move strangely out of keeping with the revolutionary spirit and policy. Dukhonin refused, not because of regard for the Bolshvik 1917 declarations, for which, indeed, he had no regard at all, but out of loyalty to the Russian and Allied imperialists. Thereupon Lenin and Stalin announced the appointment of Krylenko in Dukhonin's place.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
HTTP_ACCEPT-

Through this appointment Lenin and Stalin again violated the pre-October Bolshevik declarations. Moreover, they made one of their own recent decrees a dead letter. The decree, issued on November 15, (2) 1917, signed by Stalin and Lenin had declared: "The soldiers and sailors have been emancipated from the power of the autocratic generals, for henceforth generals are to be elective and subject to recall." (*Izvestia,* No. 215, Nov. 16, (3) 1917)

A few hours after appointing Krylenko, the Sovnarkom issued a proclamation to the Russian soldiers in which it ostensibly allowed the democratic-election method of handling the vital issues of State. "Let the regiments at the front immediately elect representatives to open truce negotiations with the enemy. The Soviet of People's Commissars gives you this authority. In every possible way keep us informed of each step in the pour-parlers, but sign no final agreement for an armistice. This can be done only by the Soviet of People's Commissars." (*Izvestia,* Nov. 23, (10) 1917)

Two days later Trotsky repeated the instruction. The burocratic feature in Trotsky's statement was that the official to take charge of negotiations was not to be elected by the soldiers from below but had been already appointed from above by the Sovnarkom: "Soldiers, continue in your fight for an immediate armistice. Elect your delegates for the negotiations. Your Commander-in-Chief, Ensign Krylenko, starts for the front today to take charge of the armistice negotiations." (*Izvestia,* Nov. 25, (12) 1917)

The soldiers met the appointed Commander-in-Chief, a State burocrat in the making, with outbursts of guileless enthusiasm. He was "received by the soldiers everywhere with tremendous ovations—a triumphal progress." (John Reed, 291). Krylenko at once proceeded with the task assigned to him by the Sovnarkom. Instead of having the soldiers elect from their own midst a number of delegates for armistice negotiations, as the Sovnarkom proclamation and Trotsky's message a few days earlier seemed to prescribe, Krylenko picked three men out of the Committee of the Fifth Army, Lieutenant Schneur, Doctor Sagalovich and Volunteer Meren, handed them a written authorization from the Sovnarkom and sent them across the lines to approach the German command with a proposal for armistice negotiations. (*Izvestia,* No. 226, Nov. 28, (15) 1917)

Thus, from the start, the threads of the peace issue—an issue which affected not only the Russian and the German masses, but the whole world—were in the hands not of a democratically elected servant of the masses but of an *appointed* official responsible only to the Sovnarkom.

Krylenko's delegates returned with a report of German acceptance of the armistice offer. The Germans, however, laid down a specific condition that fraternization at the Front must end. The Bolshevik leadership accepted this condition and Krylenko issued his far-reaching Order No. 3. Before dealing with the German condition, its acceptance by the Bolshevik leaders and Krylenko's order, we shall examine

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a/5.0
ACCEPT-

the principle of fraternization and the position it occupied in the pre-October platform of the Bolsheviks.

3. *The Meaning of Fraternization*

There is no clearer explanation of the vital function fraternization performs among the soldiers of warring imperialists powers than the one furnished by Lenin in 1917:

"It is obvious that fraternization is a road to peace. It is obvious that this road leads not to the capitalist governments, not to harmony with them, but, on the contrary, it leads against them. It is obvious that this road develops, strengthens, consolidates the feeling of brotherly confidence among the workers of various countries. It is obvious that this road is beginning to undermine the damnable discipline of the barrack prisons, the discipline requiring the absolute submission of soldiers to 'their' officers and generals, to their capitalists (for officers and generals are for the most part either members of the capitalist class or defenders of its interests). It is obvious that fraternization is the revolutionary initiative of the *masses,* that it is the awakening of the conscience, the mind, the courage of the oppressed classes, that it is, in other words, one of the links in the chain of steps leading towards the Socialist proletarian revolution.

"Long live fraternization! Long live the rising world Socialist revolution of the proletariat!" ("The Meaning of Fraternization" *C.W.* XX, B. 2, 13; *Pravda,* May 11, 1917)

Indeed, fraternization was a nightmare to the imperialists who were waging a desperate contest for the redivision of the globe. It was more ominous than a strike in any industry, than even in all industries of a given capitalist country, because fraternization of millions of troops, in motion not against each other but against their respective governments, generated frightful paralysis in the ruling classes. Trotsky gave a picture of what was happening to the Russian bourgeois officers when fraternization at the Front reached a high water mark just before October: "Fraternizing, which had almost stopped since the July days, began again and grew rapidly. Instances not only of the arrest of officers by the soldiers, but of the murder of the more hateful began to multiply. These things were done almost publicly, before the eyes of the soldiers. Nobody interfered: the majority did not want to, the small minority did not dare." (*H. of R.R.* III, 71)

The German High Command especially viewed the rapidly growing fraternization between their troops and the Russian soldiers who were communicating explosive ideas to the German soldiers, with anxiety. "The German command took a whole series of most atrocious measures against fraternization to the extent of the death penalty, but was unable to stop it." (*Gr. Sov. Enc.* VII, 380)

Unquestionably, the German imperialists were in fear lest the fraternization on the Russian Front would influence the German sol-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

la/5.0
ACCEPT-

diers to overthrow the monarchy, after the example of their Russian friends. In that period of growing ferment, for the German High Command to bring an army from the interior or from the Western Front to attack another German army on the Russian Front with a view to enforcing discipline would have been an attempt of sheer desperation. Yet the German imperialists could not let their soldiers be won away from them by that mighty revolutionary force, fraternization. Arresting and shooting individual soldiers only added fuel to the flame. The German Command made an attempt to extricate itself from the quicksands of fraternization by shifting whole regiments from the Eastern Front: "The profoundly-revolutionary influence of fraternization alarmed the German and Austrian command to such an extent that it began to apply the rule of rapid transfer of troops from the Eastern Front, with the aim of substituting other troops for them." (*Ib.*)

What was most portentious in the movement of fraternization was the fact that from being elemental and spontaneous early in 1917 it was taking an organized political aspect and just before October was receiving guidance only from the Bolsheviks. To the German imperialists the meaning of this was plain: Lenin and Trotsky were taking over the Russian Army and would soon secure a foothold in the German Army.

In the Bolshevik program, of course, fraternization was a key principled position. It was the link with which to unite the German and Russian masses against both their ruling classes, the first link in a chain of the universal fraternization of the soldiers of *all* armies for the overthrow of all capitalist powers.

Fraternization was fought by the Kaiser Socialists, followers of Scheidemann. Fraternization was fought by the Russian Mensheviks and SRs. In May 1917 the leader of the Mensheviks, Tseretelli, drafted an Appeal to the Army which was adopted by the Menshevik-controlled Petrograd Soviet. It said in part: "The people who assure you that fraternization is the road to peace lead you to destruction. Do not believe them." This was an attack upon Lenin's policy which said: "We must aid, immediately, energetically, by all means at our disposal and unconditionally, the fraternization of the soldiers of both warring groups at the front." (*Pravda,* May 1, 1917; *C.W.* XX, Bk. I, 226)

4. *The Betrayal of the Principle of Fraternization*

The Bolshevik Delegation which had been sent to open negotiations with the German High Command brought back with them the condition that mass fraternization between the Russian and German soldiers be called to a halt. What the German Command itself had been unable to accomplish even by applying the death penalty it asked the Bolshevik leaders to do. Krylenko, a Bolshevik since 1905, who in all the pre-October months after the overthrow of the Tsar had worked on the Front promoting fraternization, naturally saw at

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lla/5.0
ACCEPT-

once the gravity of the demand of the German imperialists. He was asked to barter away one of the most important, living, revolutionary principles of struggle against the international bourgeoisie. But he didn't hesitate. His order No. 3 was a definite and clear reply to the condition presented by the German imperialists: "Any one who will conceal or counteract the distribution of this Order I commit to the revolutionary tribunal of the local regimental committees without the usual formalities. I order that firing and fraternization be halted at once along the entire Front." (*Izvestia,* No. 226, Nov. 28, 1917; Cited in Trotsky's *Wks.* III, Pt II, R. 424)

Ten years later Krylenko in an article on fraternization wrote: "That the enemies were vastly concerned over fraternization is seen from the fact that during the negotiations with the Germans for the first truce, Krylenko had to accept as an *indispensable condition* the immediate termination of fraternization." (*Gr. Sov. Enc.* VII, 380. Our emph.—G.S.)

Krylenko in his article makes an assertion that "The Sovnarkom, however, immediately corrected the error with a special instruction, pointing out that such a prohibition of fraternization contradicts the principled position of revolutionary Socialism and must not take place any longer." (*Ib.*)

Krylenko assures the reader that the "error" was "corrected" by the Sovnarkom, but at the same time he contradicts this tale by stating that he had been compelled to stop fraternization as an *indispensable condition* insisted upon by the German Command, without which condition the German imperialists would not have consented to negotiations. But everybody knows that negotiations with the German imperialists got under way and continued for months. Evidently Krylenko's story of the "correction" of his Order No. 3 is a piece of Stalinist fiction, added to history as an afterthought.

Had Krylenko sold the principle of fraternization to the German imperialists in opposition to the instructions and policy of the Sovnarkom he would have been expelled from the Bolshevik Party or at least severely criticised and removed from his post as Commander-in-Chief. As it was, Krylenko was neither expelled nor reprimanded, and he was not removed during the entire Brest-Litovsk period. Despite his later story that the Sovnarkom "corrected" his "error," the fact remains that his Order No. 3 was never rescinded. Upon the conclusion of the Brest "peace" Krylenko was honored with the post of Commissar of Justice.

Since the principle of fraternization is of crucial revolutionary importance and constitutes a decisive test for a political tendency, we shall examine the question of whether in practice the revolutionary policy of fraternization was even partly restored or whether the betrayal of this basic revolutionary principle was fully carried out in the Brest "negotiations."

On December 2, 1917 the Bolshevik delegation consisting of Joffe, Kamenev, Sokolnikov, Karakhan and others arrived at Brest-Litovsk

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
_ACCEPT-

and arranged a truce with the German imperialists. Was this delegation elected by the Soviets, or by the soldiers in accord with the recent pronouncements of the Sovnarkom? The fact is that the Russian masses first learned of the personnel of the delegation from the official Government press which presented them with an accomplished fact. (*Izvestia,* No. 231, Dec. 4, 1917)

On the 13 of December the armistice discussions began, centering, among other questions, on the issue of fraternization. Two days later an agreement was signed by the Bolshevik delegation and the representatives of the Central Powers. Article IV of the agreement dealing with fraternization stated that at the Front "There must not be present *at any one time more than 25 unarmed persons from each side.*" General Max Hoffmann, one of the German negotiators, in his work *The War of Lost Opportunities,* shows that the German imperialists got what they wanted after the discussions with Joffe and Kamenev: "After much negotiations we at last succeeded in making a draft Armistice scheme which was largely in accordance with the German plan." (194)

Thus, the indispensable condition of the German imperialists which Krylenko had accepted as the basis for a truce was complied with by the Joffe-Kamenev delegation. Theirs was no hasty and unstudied act, as Krylenko presented his own to have been. Over two weeks had gone by since his Order No. 3 had been broadcast, more than sufficient time to weigh the political significance of the condition laid down by the German generals. It was accepted, obviously, on due deliberation by the Bolshevik leaders in power. It is necessary to reiterate that since this condition was considered to be indispensable by the German imperialists, had it been refused first by Krylenko and then by the Joffe-Kamenev delegation, and later by Trotsky at Brest-Litovsk, the German Command would have reverted to its original stand of ignoring all Bolshevik appeals for "peace."

The German rulers saw that if mass fraternization was playing havoc with their discipline when Germany and Russia were officially at *war,* then with the establishment of an armistice and the opening of peace negotiations their tenuous hold on the German soldiers would have snapped altogether.

Lest there be some misunderstanding that Article IV merely reduced the original mass fraternization to only twenty-five soldiers with the right of unhampered contact and discussion, we hasten to dispel this impression. Early in 1918 Kamenev published a pamphlet *The Struggle for Peace* to which he appended the Articles of the Armistice. From the wording of the Article dealing with the intercourse on the Front it is clear that freedom to the mass-soldier was definitely denied:

"The right of free intercourse is permitted for pourparlers and to members of local armistice committees, and their substitutes, who must carry on them the proper identification papers from the staffs of the corps, armies, the front or their committees. For instance at two

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

or three points on every sector of a Russian division there is organized a contact, the points are designated by agreement between the staffs of the divisions or their committees in the neutral zone between lines of demarkation indicated with white flags. The contacts are allowed only in daytime between sunrise and sunset. At the contact centers at each given moment the number of participants from each side must not exceed 25 persons." (R. 53)

This meant that no common soldier, Russian or German, could approach the points of contact. Not being a member of an armistice committee he was not eligible to receive an identification certificate which permitted participation in these "contacts." A special provision was inserted into the armistice agreement to keep each soldier on his side of the Front and punish those who attempted to restore freedom of fraternization: "Persons who cross the enemy demarkation line without observing the above-cited conditions will be arrested, the time for their release is determined either during the conclusion of peace or the rejection of the armistice. The indicated decison as well as the above-cited conditions must be announced in a special order to the troops of the negotiating parties and thoroughly explained to the troops." (54)

By this deal the Sovnarkom agreed that the German generals might arrest any soldiers attempting to restore fraternization.

Thus by the consent of the Lenin-Trotsky regime a wall was erected between the soldiers of the Russian Army and the soldiers of the Kaiser. The huge mass of men could no longer meet as previously, offering a cigarette here, a match there, parting with warm handshakes to meet next day again and cement the fraternization more firmly. Nor had they been handicapped by language barriers in expressing their revolutionary ideas. It was enough to utter the words "*Kaiser*" and "*Kerensky*" and accompany them with an appropriate gesture of disgust, then cry out "Lenin," "Trotsky," "Liebknecht," "Revolution" and each knew what the other had in mind. And in the first days after October, when the news about the Russian masses seizing the factories and land went round the world, fraternization on the Eastern Front reached immense proportions. There was only one feeling the Russian soldier masses communicated to their new comrades on the German lines: now it is your turn.

How powerful the impulse toward revolutionary fraternization among the German soldiers became can be gleaned from various sources. The Left SR Mstislavsky, a member of the Russian Delegation, testifies that during the discussions General Hoffmann told Kamenev that the German soldiers attempted to fraternize even in sectors where some Russian troops opened fire upon them:

"The controversy over fraternization is drawn out since both sides refuse to make concessions. In vain General Hoffmann attempts to induce Kamenev to retreat, asserting that the order prohibiting fraternization will not be observed in practice by the troops. 'Experience

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

has shown, no matter how severe we have been in prohibiting fraternization, our soldiers have been endeavoring to establish fraternization even at points where your soldiers met them with shots.' But Kamenev refuses to budge. In the end the German delegation agrees to establish 'organized intercourse' with this limitation that it must not be extended to the whole Front but to definite specific points established in advance." (*Brest Neg.* R. 60)

Even when the "organized intercourse" was clamped down upon both armies, many of the German soldiers crowded at night toward the Russian lines, attempting to break the rules imposed not only by the German staff but also by the Bolsheviks.

5. *The Political Significance of the Betrayal*

The significance of the abandonment of the proletarian-revolutionary position of mass fraternization by the Bolshevik leaders was manifold. It countered the tactic of setting all armies in motion towards fraternization, discouraged the attempts not only on the Russian but on *all* the fronts of the World War. Had mass fraternization been extended and deepened on the Russian Front, it would have inevitably reached France and Italy. As it was, the forced separation of the German from the Russian soldiers broke the link of the world revolutionary chain which the war and the events in Russia had begun to forge against international imperialism. Having secured as a peace offering a mighty political concession from the Lenin-Trotsky regime, the German imperialists could now breathe freely because fraternization had begun, to use Lenin's pre-October words, "to undermine the damnable discipline of the barrack prisons, the discipline requiring the absolute submission of soldiers to 'their' officers and generals." (*Pravda,* May 11, 1917). The termination of fraternization enabled the German generals to begin restoring that discipline. In consequence, the discipline over their soldiers facing the British, French and Italian armies was tightened. In fine, by the conscious yielding up of the proletarian-revolutionary principle of mass fraternization to the German imperialists the Bolshevik leadership delivered to them the recalcitrant German soldiers on all fronts.

The discontinuance of the great mass fellowship of the German and Bolshevik soldiers aided also the Allied imperialists who were determined to go on with the War. As early as 1915 there had been attempts at fraternization among the Allied and German groups. Military authorities on the Western Front issued orders defining fraternization as *state treason.* (Lenin, *Sotsial Democrat,* No. 40, March 29, 1915). In 1917 there were signs of opposition to war, particularly in the French army. The Lenin-Trotsky Brest policy on fraternization caused a serious damage to the proletariat in yet another aspect. While strengthening the hands of the German and Allied imperialists, it, at the same time, dealt an extremely heavy demoralizing blow to the Russian Army. Not having the slightest notion that a major revolu-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tionary position had been bargained away, the soldiers accepted the new policy which, supposedly, was in the interests of the world revolution and of genuine democratic peace. Mass memory never retains the precise formulation of a principle. The soldiers were no researchers to check Lenin's stated position before the seizure of power. In the past their mental activity had been regulated by the Tsarist regime and it was only a brief few months since they had begun to develop any sort of independent consciousness. After October, intoxicated with the exciting events and enthusiastic speeches, they could never suspect that a serious departure from the pre-October position was taking place. Because the natural dynamic impulse to fraternization with the German soldiers was stifled, the Russian soldiers were now compelled to talk only among themselves. The free outpouring of revolutionary ideas and feelings lost their original meaning. Their settled course of thinking and attention now was concentrated not on the German soldiers but on the "peace" bickerings at Brest-Litovsk.

6. *"Fraternization" of Delegations at Brest-Litovsk*

"Peace negotiations are to be conducted not with the bourgeois governments, but with the proletariat of all warring countries." So wrote Lenin a few weeks after the overthrow of the Tsar. "These are the only possible Socialist, revolutionary tactics." (*C.W.* XX B. I, 79). But following the acquisition of power, Lenin introduced a "slight" modification. Instead of carrying on peace negotations with the representatives of the German proletariat, he carried on the negotiations with the German imperialists.

On the other hand in the first phase of negotiations the Bolshevik leadership introduced a farcical feature by bringing with them as sheer decorations a worker, a sailor, a peasant and a soldier. Even those four unofficial "delegates" were not elected by some representative institutions but were picked up at random. Except as exhibits, they played a negative role, because the German imperialists, raising no objections to their presence, attempted, according to Trotsky, to worm some information out of them. "The first delegation included a worker, a peasant, and a soldier. They were accidental figures, little prepared for that sort of trickery. The old peasant was induced to drink more than was good for him." (*My Life,* II, 88). Even the Liberal friends of the Lenin-Trotsky regime perceived the artificial situation. Louis Fischer later wrote: "A worker, a sailor, a soldier, and a peasant who were there as useless exhibits of the new Russian democracy." (*Sov. in W. A.* 33). The silly comedy was soon abandoned.

Having lightly disposed of the principle of revolutionary fraternization, the Joffe-Kamenev delegation just as lightly put into practice a new "principle," unknown in the former days of the Bolshevik Party. The delegates developed a new form of fraternization between themselves and the German generals and diplomats. The situation must have reached such an ugly degree that Trotsky, arriving later in Brest

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and discovering how far things had drifted, saw the need for creating a proper atmosphere: "As chairman of the Soviet delegation, I decided to put an abrupt end to the familiarity that had imperceptibly been established during the early period." (*My Life,* II, 90)

If the *concrete* policy of the Bolshevik chiefs was not discernible to the Bolshevik workers and soldiers, it was clearly recognized by the German General Staff. The German imperialists understood very well the meaning of the "division" the Bolshevik leaders established between the Sovnarkom and the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, with the one body executing "practical" deeds in direct violation of revolutionary principles, and the other continuing to utter usual revolutionary phrases. The familiarity with the German imperialists into which Joffe-Kamenev-Sokolnikov slid was no accident. It was an acceptable expedient also to the German imperialists. True, *prior to the truce parleys,* the Kaiser's General Staff had intensely hated the Bolsheviks because by degrees they vigorously pushed mass fraternization which was wrecking the German Army on the Eastern Front, had called the German generals "imperialist butchers" and spoke of meeting them not in a peace conference but on the field of revolutionary battle.

But a stupendous transformation of attitude had occurred since the October Revolution. It was, consequently, with a certain sense of aptness that Joffe-Kamenev-Sokolnikov and the Kaiser's Foreign Minister von Kuehlmann, Prince Hohenhole, Prince Leopold of Bavaria, Chief of Staff of the Eastern Front General Hoffmann, Austro-Hungarian Foreign Minister Count Czernin, Count Coleredo, Count Csaky, Grand Vizier Talaat Pasha, and other imperialist bandits found themselves drawn into a form of social amicability. Had there been no deal on the revolutionary principle of fraternization, none of these people would have been dining and wining together in Brest-Litovsk.

On December 27, 1917, twelve days after the Joffe delegation had signed the Armistice agreement, Trotsky recalled that the political opponents of the Bolsheviks "only recently predicted that the Germans would not even talk to us." (II, 226). The opponents, quite naturally, had based their forecast on the assumption that the seeming revolutionary intransigence of the Bolshevik leadership, so vociferous prior to October, was a permanent feature, and, therefore, logically, believed that the German imperialists and the Bolshevik leaders were separated by the same chasm which divided the Russian bourgeoisie and the Bolsheviks.

A curious feature in the attitude of the German imperialists was the sympathetic tone adopted by their press toward Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders. "General Hoffmann's staff was publishing a paper called *Russky Vestnik* for the Russian prisoners; in its early period it spoke of the Bolsheviks not otherwise than with touching sympathy." (*My Life,* II, 88). Trotsky objected: " 'We are about to regret the premature compliments paid us by the official German and Austro-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Hungarian press. This was quite unnecessary for the successful course of peace negotiations.' " (*Ib.*)

What led the German imperialists to use such methods during their negotiations with the Lenin-Trotsky Government? Trotsky quite inadvertently wrote in the Brest period: "The secret of the conduct of Kuehlmann diplomacy consisted of the gentleman being sincerely convinced of our readiness to play his game." (*On the History of October Revolution,* R. 97). This was not Trotsky's impression alone. An editorial in *Izvestia* of January 9 (22), 1918, spoke in a similar vein: "What was Kuehlmann hoping for? It is plain that he figured that the Russian delegation would aid him in concealing from the nations concerned the true contents of the German peace program." What could have given rise to such a seemingly absurd idea in the head of one of the keenest agents of German imperialism? Surely no serious bourgeois politician or statesman had ever entertained even a glimmer of such hope before. Trotsky further says: "In other words, Kuehlmann calculated on a tacit agreement with us: he would return to us our good formulas, we would enable him, without a protest, to secure provinces and nations for Germany. In the eyes of the German workers the annexationist grab would consequently receive the sanction of the Russian Revolution." (*On the History,* 98)

Many years later, referring to this strange outlook of the German Foreign Minister, Trotsky, in exile in Turkey, felt constrained to offer the following explanation: "Kuehlmann's self-deception was strengthened no doubt by the statements of our Liberals, Mensheviks, and Populists, who had been representing the Brest negotiations as a comedy with roles assigned in advance." (*My Life,* II, 97-8)

Kuehlmann, of course, was not misled by such nonsense as Trotsky puts forth. In the same work of Trotsky's Kuehlmann is shown to be a leading imperialist diplomat. Keenly watching the drama in Russia, the Kuehlmanns of world imperialism were familiarizing themselves with the character and policy of Bolshevism not through the noisy stories appearing in the Russian Liberal press but by diligently studying the *concrete* policies of Lenin and Trosky. When the Lenin-Trotsky regime issued a bare appeal for peace, Kuehlmann did not reply. But when an offer for concluding the armistice was accompanied with a definite payment in the form of the revolutionary principle of fraternization, Kuehlmann saw that the Bolsheviks evinced readiness to make horse deals. General von Hoffmann in his book *The War of Lost Opportunities* says that when the German Command on the Eastern Front received the Sovnarkom's concrete proposal for an armistice the offer was immediately forwarded to General Ludendorff. Ludendorff inquired over the telephone "Is it possible to negotiate with these people?" Hoffmann's reply was "Yes, it is possible to negotiate with them." (195)

There were other episodes at Brest to show that the imperialists of the Central Powers saw Trotsky not as a man of noble ideals, not

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as an irreconcilable revolutionist, but as a politician seeking to make a deal. C. Mstislavsky wrote of what he and other members of the Russian delegation felt about the German attitude to have been: "We felt that they saw us not as messengers of a victorious Revolution which marched to greater heights and achievements but simply as politicians who arrived to talk peace. Precisely because of that the persistent 'revolutionary' declarations of the delegation at the sessions were greeted with the greatest outward respect, with 'submission,' if you wish, but behind this respect there was no 'faith' in the real force, in the *truth* of those declarations." (*Brest Neg.* R. 37)

7. *A Two-Faced Policy on Wilson*

The Bolshevik leaders were quite certain of one thing when they approached German imperialism with a proposal to open "peace" negotiations. They entertained no doubts that the German rulers would inevitably impose oppressive, piratical terms on the Bolshevk State. In his work *On The History of the October Revolution* Trotsky wrote: "How miserable are the assertions of the bourgeois press that we required two months of discussions with Kuehlmann to learn that German imperialism would present robber terms. No, we knew that in advance." (103). It follows, therefore, that Trostky knew well the hypocritical essence of the December 25, 1917 declaration of the Austrian Foreign Minister Count Czernin for Germany, Austro-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey: "The delegation of the Quadruple Alliance are prepared to conclude immediately a general peace without forcible annexations or indemnities. They agree with the Russian delegation, which condemned the continuation of the war for the sake of conquest." Had Trotsky been acting in accord with the pre-October verbal sentiments, he would have torn the mask off the predatory features of the Czernins and Kuehlmanns. But Trotsky lent his authority to that piece of imperialist duplicity. "Our diplomacy has scored great success." he said on December 27, 1917 in the course of reporting to the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets. And he painted a picture of the German imperialist leopard changing its spots: "Germany gives in not merely to the force of truth but to the fear of revolution which menaces the very existence of the bourgeois regime." (III, Pt II, 227)

At Brest Trotsky's friend Joffe expressed satisfaction that "Germany and her allies so far from having plans of conquest, do not aim at the destruction of the political independence of any people whatsoever." (Cited by Judah L. Magnes in *Russia and Germany at Brest-Litovsk,* 34). However, two days later, at luncheon, General Hoffmann informed Joffe that the German troops would not be withdrawn from the occupied Baltic countries and Poland. This was a bombshell. Kuehlmann and Czernin confirmed Hoffmann's statement. The Germans framed their annexationist demands in diplomatic language and their proposal was telegraphed to the Sovnarkom. The reaction among

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the masses everywhere made many of the German imperialists recognize that they had made a serious error. Prince Max von Baden wrote sometime later: "On December 28, 1917 we committed an irreparable mistake; we aroused in the whole world and in the German masses the impression that, in contradiction to the Russian attitude, our agreement to the principle of the self-determination of nations was insincere and a mere shield for annexationist designs." (*Erinnerungen und Dokumente,* 191)

The Bolshevik Delegation, though protesting, did not break off negotiations. It requested an interruption. The purpose was explained in an official message of Trotsky's on December 29, 1917: "The Peace pourparlers at Brest-Litovsk . . . interrupted for ten days until January 8 in order to give a last chance to the Allied countries to take part in the further pourparlers and thus safeguard themselves from the consequences of a separate peace between Russia and enemy countries."

The Sovnarkom's move was an attempt to bring the Allies into the parleys with the Germans and thus to submerge the Russian issue in the general question of peace among all the war powers. On January 2, 1918 Joffe telegraphed general Hoffmann a proposal to transfer the negotiations from the German-held Brest-Litovsk to neutral Stockholm. The object behind the move, obviously, was to offer a face-saving inducement to the Allies to enter the negotiations. This proposal the German imperialists flatly rejected. In their annexationist design the German imperialists realized they could act as masters only in territory directly under their control. This was another indispensable condition, and the Lenin-Trotsky regime dropped its proposal.

The Allied imperialists, bent on achieving a robber victory—an intention very well known to the Bolshevik leaders who were now indulging in diplomatic chess moves—disregarded the new Bolshevik call.

On January 8, 1918 President Wilson delivered his Fourteen Points address in Congress. Wilson used sugared words about the Bolsheviks at Brest: "The Russian representatives were sincere and in earnest. They cannot entertain such proposals of conquest and domination." Hitting the annexationist policy of the German imperialists, Wilson pretended before the masses to be a champion of justice for Bolshevik Russia and in Point 6 definitely demanded that German imperialism evacuate "all Russian territory."

Louis Fischer summarized the attitude of the Bolshevik leaders towards Wilson: "The President's speech was placarded on the walls of Petrograd. It was printed on a hundred thousand Russian posters and three hundred thousand Russian handbills. The American Y.M.C.A. availing itself of Bolshevik aid, distributed one million copies throughout the Russian lines and another million, in German, within the German trenches on the Eastern front. All the papers published the statement in full. Its contents were wired to Trotsky at Brest who radioed them to 'All, all, all.'" (*Sov. in W.A.* 41-42)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The artificial division between the Sovnarkom which *acted* one way and the Bolshevik Party which *talked* the opposite way could best be observed in the difference in the comments about Wilson in the "Government" paper *Izvestia* and in the "Party" organ *Pravda*. *Izvestia* put on a politically naive and innocent countenance: "The conditions laid down by President Wilson represent a great victory in the great struggle for democratic peace, and we may hope to find in the American people an actual ally in that struggle." *Pravda*, however, verbally presented a "revolutionary" face on Wilson: "We do not believe in the friendship or nobility of feeling of the servant of American capital."

8. *The Mysterious Tactic of Delay*

After a ten day interruption, the parleys at Brest were resumed. The new phase of negotiations, starting on January 7, 1918, was conducted by Trotsky, now the key figure at the Brest performance. His chief aim in going to Brest was to prolong the discussions, to kill time. The tactic was carried out with Lenin's approval, perhaps instruction. "Trotsky's tactic insofar as it secured the delay was correct." (Lenin, *C.W.* XV, R. 144)

From Trotsky's records it is clear that he was not democratically chosen by the masses or by the Party membership, but was arbitrarily selected by the presiding officer of the Sovnarkom. Indeed, from the moment the Sovnarkom had ordered General Dukhonin to open negotiations and to the post-Trotsky Bolshevik delegation headed by Karakhan who signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, the choosing of emissaries was a burocratic Sovnarkom affair.

The general impression was that the aim behind the Lenin-Trotsky stalling tactic was aimed at arousing the proletarian forces in Germany. Curiously, the German imperialists did not oppose Trotsky's delaying line but actually fell in with it and even excelled him in drawing out the discussions. On the point as to who did the delaying, Trotsky writes in his autobiography: "But in this respect I can claim no credit for myself. My partners helped me as best they could. 'Time is plentiful here,' Czernin writes melancholically in his diary. 'Now it is the Turks who are not ready, now again it is the Bulgarians, now the Russians—and the meetings are adjourned again, or else broken off after they had hardly begun. The Austrians, in turn, began to delay the negotiations when they struck their difficulties with the Ukrainian delegation. Of course this did not hinder Kuehlmann and Czernin in their public statements from accusing the Russian delegation alone for the delay in the negotiations. I protested against this insistently, but quite in vain." (II, 94-5)

It is obvious that both the Bolshevik leaders and the German-Austrian-Turkish-Bulgarian diplomats were bent on killing time. It could hardly be said that if the Bolsheviks' alleged motive were to arouse the German masses, the German imperialists too were prompted by this motive.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In whose interests, then, was the dragging out of the Brest-Litovsk talks? Trotsky said that "The delay in negotiations was in our interests. That actually was my real object in going to Brest." (II, 94). Ostensibly the word "our" meant the masses of Russia. However, insofar as the interests of the Russian masses were concerned, despite the steady sweep of the Bolshevik power in Great Russia, White Russia, Finland, Esthonia, the Ukraine, large parts of Siberia and Central Asia, on the Don and Kuban and in the Crimea, their position at Brest instead of growing stronger was systematically deteriorating as history amply records.

That the German imperialists sought to drag out the negotiations is understandable. The more time elapsed with no fraternization between the German and Russian soldiers the greater the chance for the success of their plans of spoilation. The extremely slow pace of the "negotiations" affected the German soldiers on the Eastern Front quite differently than it did the Russian soldiers. Since Germany would remain at war with the Allies even if peace were actually established in the East, the German soldier on the Russian Front could only welcome the protracted negotiations as affording him a long-yearned for rest. As for the Russian soldier, his patience had been all but exhausted yet during the Kerensky regime. After October he expected the proletarian revolution, as foreshadowed in the Bolshevik agitation, to bring about a speedy solution of the war issue. The interminable discussions with the diplomats and generals of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, following the abrogation of mass fraternization, could work only for his demoralization.

The creeping pace of the Brest "negotiations" was also utilized by the German imperialists in their intrigue with the anti-Bolshevik Ukrainian regime whose representatives were brought to Brest-Litovsk to arrange a "peace" for the Ukraine.

Hence, there was nothing puzzling in the strategy of procrastination pursued by the German and Austrian imperialists; but there was a mystery in Lenin's policy of dragging out the discussions at Brest.

9. *Trotsky's "Battle of Words"*

One of the traditional fairy tales persisted in by many Liberals and by Trotskyites of all shades is that Trotsky used Brest-Litovsk as a forum for revolutionary speechmaking to stir the masses of Germany and other capitalist countries. However, as the records prove *(Peace Negotiations in Brest-Litovsk,* R.), Trotsky at Brest-Litovsk did not utter a single phrase of revolutionary-proletarian exposure of Capitalism and of the Imperialist War. Before he became a high State official, Trotsky had repeatedly blasted German Social Democracy as the political mainstay of German imperialism. But at Brest he was strangely silent about this role of German Social Democracy. Prior to October Trotsky and Lenin had regarded Karl Liebknecht and his comrades as the only true revolutionists in Germany. But at Brest

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky withheld any reference to Liebknecht's anti-war, anti-Kaiser stand, raised no demand for Liebknecht's release from the fortress where the Kuehlmanns and Hoffmanns had imprisoned him. Trotsky's speeches at Brest were a fog of evasive generalities calculated only to while away the hours, not a dissemination of revolutionary principles. In his "battle of words" with Kuehlmann, Czernin and Hoffmann for a "democratic peace," Trotsky consciously ignored the dicta of German imperialism as expressed in Chancellor Bethmann-Holveg's statement justifying the invasion of Belgium in 1914: "A treaty is a scrap of paper" and "necessity knows no law." Had Trotsky spoken the plain revolutionary truth that the German imperialists were perfidious, predatory and oppressive, had he honestly stated that the word of the German Government was not to be trusted, that if it contemptuously labelled a treaty signed with "respectable" and "legitimate" capitalist powers as a scrap of paper, it would never respect a treaty with the Bolsheviks, he would have been ordered to leave Brest-Litovsk at once. Trotsky maintained a dishonest silence on every subject dangerous to German imperialism. As a result the German imperialists allowed him to stay and continue his "battle of words."

It was despite Trotsky's "peace" lectures at Brest, not because of them, that the masses of Germany, Austria and Hungary early in January 1918 erupted in strikes and demonstrations. Just as years later the mass upheavals in China, Spain and other countries were due to objective factors not to the "revolutionary" activity of the Stalinists, so the January 1918 strikes and peace riots in the Central Empires came not as a result of Trotsky's empty bombast but because of three and a half years of slaughter, military tyranny and widespread starvation. As with the Russian masses a year earlier, the patience of the German, Austrian and Hungarian workers reached the breaking point.

The first explosion occurred in the German Navy which had already been shaken by outbreaks in the Autumn of 1917. On January 7, 1918 a mutiny started among the submarine crews at the Kiel naval base, the sailors demanding immediate cessation of the war *on the basis of no annexations and no indemnities.* Thirty-eight naval officers were reported to have been killed and many wounded. The movement spread to the ranks of the workers. On January 19, 1918 strikes paralyzed Vienna and Budapest. The frightened German imperialists, who had never experienced a war-time strike movement, sought to assure the workers that the Government would strive to end the military conflict. In the Hungarian Parliament Premier Wekerle officially stated that his Government was against annexations and indemnities.

Germany was swept by demands for peace—causing the Independent Socialists who had been lukewarm pacifists to make a sharp turn to the Left. Defying the military authorities, the Reichstag members of the Independent Socialists on January 10, 1918 issued a manifesto against the German Brest policy. They went no further than demands for peace *without annexations and indemnities.* However, hundreds of thousands of their proletarian followers, imbued ideologically with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the promises of the Bolshevik Revolution, talked of establishing Soviets in Germany and of overthrowing international imperialism.

Catching a measure of the fire and enthusiasm of the Russian workers, the German proletariat struck at the sinews of its rulers by paralyzing the war industry. Toward the close of January 1918 Soviets were actualy set up in Vienna, Budapest and other centers. *Pravda* on January 25, (12) 1918 reported the development in stirring words: "The red flag of the Communist revolution is raised in Europe. Soviets of workers' deputies have been set up in Vienna and Budapest. At Warsaw there is about to begin a general strike of the Socialist proletariat. Here, too, the revolution has formed Soviets of workers. In Berlin *Vorwarts* has been suppressed. Long live the International revolution! Long live the International Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies!" Two days later a Soviet of Workers' Deputies was formed in strike-swept Berlin. The scale and tempo of the movement compelled even the pro-war Kaiser Socialists to adhere to it in an attempt to check its Leftward development. The Berlin Soviet formulated a number of demands the first two of which read: "*Peace without annexations and indemnities, based on the right of the free action of the peoples, as soon as possible. 2. Labour representatives from all countries shall participate in the peace negotiations.*" This second demand of the Berlin Soviet was infinitely closer to a revolutionary position than the line of Trotsky at Brest-Litovsk.

10. *Lenin's Theses on Peace*

Resentment against the policy of "negotiations" with German imperialism steadily mounted in the Bolshevik Party. Three days after Trotsky had arrived at Brest-Litovsk, "On January 10, 1918 (December 28, 1917) the Moscow Regional Buro of the Party passed a resolution demanding the cessation of peace negotiations with imperialist Germany and also the rupture of all diplomatic relations 'with all the diplomatic pirates of all countries.' " (Lenin, *C.W.* VII, "Expl. Notes," 490). "The Petersburg Committee of the Party also adopted on Jan. 10, 1918 (Dec. 28, 1917) theses in which it categorically protested against the possibility of conclusion of imperialist peace treaty with Germany." (*Prolet. Rev.* No. 5, 1929, 11)

These decisions of the two greatest centers of the Bolshevik Party struck directly at Lenin's policy. Ten days later Lenin answered the opponents of "negotiations" with his Theses on Peace.

The Theses were written in the period of the *rising* tide of strikes and demonstrations in the Central Empires. Amazingly enough, while the German and Austro-Hungarian workers were coming out in support of the original Bolshevik declarations for peace without annexations and indemnities, Lenin in his Thesis on Peace made a complete about-face and urged the acceptance of Kuehlmann's annexationist demands. If Lenin's calculation in dragging out the negotiations had been to allow the anti-annexationist sentiment in Germany to ripen,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

then surely when it did burst out one would have expected him to redouble the struggle for a just peace. But Lenin's line now ran diametrically counter to this spreading anti-annexationist sentiment. A few days after he had introduced the Theses the wires brought tremendous news about the establishment of Soviets in Vienna, Budapest and Berlin, a report of the statement of the leader of the Right Social-Democrats, Scheidemann, that they would cease supporting the Kaiser Government if it failed to conclude peace with Russia (January 25, 1918), and of the spread of strikes to the war industries in Berlin, Hamburg, Essen and Kiel under the slogan *"Peace without annexations and indemnities!"* (January 30, 1918). Yet Lenin did not abandon his position of signing a German annexationist "peace." Nay, for some hidden reason he even fought more determinedly for it than ever before!

In his Theses on Peace Lenin in effect argued against his own revolutionary pledges of the days before he had assumed power. One of the clearest formulations of that abandoned pre-October program was as follows: "The party agitators must protest over and over again against the contemptible slander manufactured by the capitalists to the effect that our party stands for a separate peace with Germany; in our eyes Wilhelm II is a crowned murderer deserving execution no less than Nicholas II, and the German Guchkovs, i.e. the German capitalists, are usurpers, robbers and imperialists no less than the Russian, English and all other capitalists; we are against negotiating with the capitalists, we are for negotiating and fraternizing *with the revolutionary workers and soldiers of all countries." (Pravda,* May 5, 1917; *C.W.* XX, Bk I, 246)

Lenin's acceptance of the annexationist "peace" was no isolated retreat from the revolutionary declarations but one of a sequence. He had abandoned the revolutionary position of no separate peace, no negotiations and no signing of agreements with the German imperialists, and most vital of all, mass fraternization. As records show, the last moment when Lenin still defended, at least in words, the intransigent line was the night of the October Revolution, before the assumption of power by the Sovnarkom. Speaking to the Second Congress of the Soviets, he positively stated: "We of course, will in every way defend our program of peace without annexations and indemnities. We will not depart from it." Now Lenin not "merely" departed from that program but fought *against* it at the time imperialist Germany was being shaken by the proletarian cry of *"No annexations and no indemnities,"* when in support of this slogan 500,000 munitions workers were on strike in Berlin alone! (XXIII, "Exp. Notes," 106)

From Lenin's Theses on Peace it is seen that he had the position of accepting a German annexationist "peace" sometime prior to writing the document. N. Ovsiannikov in his article "The Central Committee of the RCP and the Brest Peace" says: "Lenin from the very start held the point of view that in order to preserve the basis of the proletarian revolution in Russia it was necessary to conclude peace

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with Germany even upon oppressive terms, allowing the possibility of concluding a separate peace if the 'Allies' did not agree to enter the peace negotiations, persisting in 'victory' at all costs." (Supplement to Lenin's *C.W.* XV, R. 620)

The points made in the Theses on Peace against the 1917 revolutionary ideas were unsound and inconsistent. "Examining the arguments for an immediate revolutionary war," the Theses said, "we first of all are facing the argument that a separate peace is now objectively an understanding with the German imperialists, an 'imperialist deal,' etc., and that, therefore, such a peace would be a complete break with the basic principles of proletarian internationalism. This conclusion is obviously false." (65). But this "false" conclusion was precisely the one that Lenin had arrived at only seven months earlier and on the basis of which he had won the support of the workers: "As regards separate peace, I have already stated that there can be no separate peace for us; the resolution of our Party proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that we reject this as we reject any agreement with the capitalists. To us separate peace means entering into an agreement with the German robbers, who are quite as predatory as the others." (Speech on the War at the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets, June 22, 1917, *C.W.* XX, Bk. II, 210-211)

In September 1917, several weeks before Lenin's rise to power, when the talk spread that the Russian bourgeoisie, in order to end the revolutionary upheaval, contemplated to withdraw from the War through a separate peace with the Kaiser, Lenin wrote: "*only our* victory in an uprising will *put an end* to the game of a separate peace against the revolution...." (*S.W.* XXI, B. I, 227). No sooner was that victory solidified than Lenin himself followed a policy of separate peace.

In his Theses on Peace, in one and the same paragraph, Lenin denied and admitted that his line would weaken the German revolution: "And the German revolution will not at all be impeded in its objective essence, if we conclude a separate peace. Probably, for a time the fumes of chauvinism will *weaken* the revolution, but the position of Germany will remain extremely grave." What a change in Lenin's officially propagated outlook and policy! Before he had established the Sovnarkom he had presented the revolution in Europe as one inseparable process, with the Russian revolution accelerating the development in Germany and other countries: "The Russian proletariat must not forget, however, that its movement and revolution are only part of a world-wide revolutionary proletarian movement, which in Germany, for example, is gaining momentum with every passing day. Only from this angle can we define our tasks." (Speech at the May 1917 conference, *C.W.* XX, Bk. I, 271)

But with the control of the State power transferred from the Congress of Soviets to his Cabinet regime, the tasks of the Russian proletariat were defined by Lenin quite differently. He now made a

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

separation in the international revolutionary process by laying down a policy which would admittedly strengthen German reaction and weaken the German revolution.

There was one statement in Lenin's Theses on Peace which shattered his whole false position. The German proletariat, though at first thrown back by the Kaiser's generals who were strengthened because of the Brest negotiations, eventually smashed the Imperial regime (November, 1918) eight months after the Fourth Congress of Soviets had ratified the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. In his Theses on Peace Lenin said he *would reject* the German robber "peace" and would agree to a revolutionary war if the German proletariat rose within *three or four months!* "If the German revolution should break out during the next three or four months then perhaps the tactic of an immediate revolutionary war would not ruin our socialist revolution." His choice of a policy of revolutionary war, it seemed, hinged on the rapid development of the German revolution. Yet he unswervingly insisted on a policy of an imperialist robber "peace" which, he fully realized and acknowledged, would defer the revolution in Germany. But if this policy would weaken the German masses and strengthen their oppressors then a different policy could produce a reverse result. Nevertheless Lenin would adopt no other policy than an annexationist German "peace."

Lenin's statement that he would agree to the tactic of revolutionary war if the German proletariat were to rise in three or four months invalidated another of his statements in the same Theses that the Russian masses were war-weary and would not fight. How then would Lenin have fought the revolutionary war? As a matter of fact the Russian masses, after the signing of the Brest" peace," fought for three years in a bloody civil war and against German and Allied imperialist intervention.

No matter which way Lenin turned the "fire" of his Theses on Peace it was unable to pierce the solid armor of logic and facts. There were reports that the German Socialists had turned to the Left under the pressure of the masses and had called on the Bolshevik leaders in Russia not to bow before the Kaiser. Lenin in the Theses rejected the reported call of the German Social Democrats on the ground that a war against German imperialism would in some way unite Bolshevik Russia with the Allied imperialists: "It is said that the German Social Democrats who are opposed to the war have become 'defeatists' and beg us not to give in to German imperialism. However, our position of defeatism refered only to our own imperialist bourgeoisie, but we always rejected a victory over foreign imperialism, a victory secured through a union, real or formal, with a 'friendly' imperialism as a principally impermissible and worthless method."

It is true that before October the Bolsheviks rejected any alliance with any imperialist power. That was a principled, revolutionary position: "No peace with the German capitalists, and no alliance with

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the English and French capitalists!" (Lenin, Speech at the First Congress of Soviets.) But why, then, did Lenin and Trotsky soon after October talk with the Allies about military aid? "Negotiations with the Allies about military and technical help had begun soon after the October Revolution. They were carried on by Lenin and me." (*Stalin,* 252)

Evidently in the beginning Lenin and Trotsky weighed the possibility of resisting German imperialism and—principles or no principles—counted on getting aid from the Allied imperialists. Probably that accounts for their early statement that the Soviet Government "is not at all seeking to break with its Allies . . ." (*Izvestia,* Nov. 11, 1917). And only a month after having written the Theses on Peace, when the French Ambassador Noulens on February 21, 1918 had informed Trotsky: "In your resistance to Germany you may count on the military and financial cooperation of France" (*Stalin,* 252), Lenin adopted the very policy he supposedly rejected on principle in the Theses on Peace. Ovsiannikov records Lenin's statement during the voting on the question of accepting aid from the Allied imperialists: " 'Please add my vote *for* accepting help and arms from the brigands of Anglo-French imperialism!" (Lenin, *C.W.* XV, R. 631)

It is obvious that if in the Theses on Peace Lenin rejected a "union, real or formal" with other imperialists to secure a victory over German imperialism it was not because he sought to maintain a principled position—after establishing the Sovnarkom regime he was discarding principles wholesale—but because he was bent on carrying out his "peace" policy at all costs.

The most striking statement in the Theses on Peace is the denial that Lenin and the other Bolshevik leaders who now advocated separate "peace" with German imperialism were violating their own pledges. The denial read: "It is said that in a series of party declarations we plainly 'promised' a revolutionary war, and that the conclusion of a separate peace will be a violation of our pledge. This is *not* true. We spoke of the *necessity* for a socialist government in the epoch of imperialism to 'prepare and conduct' a revolutionary war." (Our emph.—G.S.)

But it *was* true! As we have shown, Lenin before October had stated and with much emphasis that he was opposed to a separate peace; and he had promised that when the imperialist governments rejected the appeal of the Soviet power for a just, democratic peace, the Russian proletariat would conduct a revolutionary war against *all* capitalist governments. Lenin had used the word "prepare" in connection with the policy of revolutionary *war* not with a policy of seeking a separate "peace." He had never used it in the sense presented in the Theses on Peace. The sense of that word "prepare" in the Theses on Peace is: first we shall conclude a separate, annexationist peace with the German imperialists in order to obtain a "breathing spell" during which we shall make preparations for a revolution-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ary war. But Lenin's entire official 1917 line up to the time he set up the Sovnarkom vouches for the fact that *any* peace with German imperialism was definitely excluded. It is obvious, therefore, that in the Theses on Peace Lenin gave a "peace" interpretation to the word "prepare." The word actually served him as a screen behind which he violated three of his most distinct 1917 revolutionary pledges: 1), not to conduct *any* negotiations with imperialist robbers; 2) not to conclude a separate peace with German imperialism; 3) not to agree to a peace with annexations. Lenin's new position was not really *peace* but was actual *capitulation* to the Kaiser. "The meaning of the Brest capitulation was summed up for Lenin in the words 'breathing spell.' " (Trotsky, *H. of R.R.* III, 393)

11. *Lenin Versus the Bolshevik Party and the Soviets*

Lenin's shift from his pre-October declared principles evoked a disturbance and eventually a storm in the Bolshevik Party and in the Soviets. When his position of capitulation became known to the leaders of the Party, the Left Communists led by Bukharin asserted they stood for revolutionary war, while Trotsky advanced a formula: "We stop the war, we do not conclude peace, we demobilize the army." The records indicate that the Bolshevik Party and the Soviets were overwhelmingly against Lenin's line. "In all the directing institutions of the Party and State, Lenin was in a minority. To the proposal of the Sovnarkom to local Soviets that they express their opinion on war and peace, over two hundred responded prior to March 5. Of them all, only two large Soviets—Petrograd and Sevastopol (with reservations) went on record in favor of peace. On the other hand, a whole number of the big workers' centers, such as Moscow . . . Kronstadt, etc., voted by overwhelming majorities to break off negotiations. The same sentiment prevailed among our Party organizations, and naturally among the Left Socialist-Revolutionists." (*My Life,* II, 110-111). The definite rejection by the Russian masses and the Party membership of Lenin's line of capitulation to German imperialism was no momentary phenomenon. Trotsky states that "throughout the entire critical period the preponderant majority of Party organizations and Soviets stood for revolutionary war." (*Stalin,* 250)

Fully aware of the revolutionary war sentiment of the Russian proletariat, Lenin first sought to break down the resistance to his line in the very top layer of the Bolshevik Party. On January 21, 1918, a day after he had finished writing the Theses on Peace "These theses were read by N. Lenin and subjected to a discussion at a private conference of the most outstanding Bolshevik-delegates who had arrived for the Third Congress of Soviets." (Ovsiannikov, 620). There followed a heated discussion at this secret meeting. What Lenin and the opponents to his capitulatory line said was never made public. "The minutes of this meeting have not been preserved." (*Ib.*). When the vote was taken, Lenin, despite a passioned defense of his line, suffered

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

defeat. The Left Communists won more votes than Lenin and Trotsky combined: "The supporters of revolutionary war obtained thirty-two votes, Lenin fifteen, and I sixteen. But the results of the voting are not really indicative of the mood dominant in the party. In the upper stratum, if not among the masses, the 'Left wing' was even stronger." (*My Life,* II, 110)

After this secret test Lenin realized that were he to leave the decision to the forthcoming Third Soviet Congress, which was nominally the chief governing body of Russia, his line would have been rejected. Continuing his efforts in the top Party leadership, Lenin next day, on January 22, 1918, took up the question at the Central Committee of the Party. Here in his speeches he again tangled himself in obvious contradictions. In the Theses on Peace he clearly stated that probably the conclusion of a peace with Germany would weaken the revolution in that country. But when Zinoviev made a similar observation he objected: "He disagrees with Zinoviev that the conclusion of peace will temporarily weaken the movement in the West." (Ovsiannikov, 623)

Most astounding was Lenin's reaction to the tangibly rising wave of revolutionary struggle in Germany. As far back as his stay in Switzerland Lenin had seen auspicious signs of the developing revolutionary resistance on the part of the German masses. In May 1917 (*Pravda,* No. 38) Lenin had charged that even the Guchkov-Miliukov government "knows full well that the proletarian revolution in Germany is beginning, and that that revolution will be a blow to the capitalists of all countries." In his report at the May 1917 Party Conference Lenin called attention to the fact "that a revolutionary fermentation is beginning in the German army. These facts tend to indicate that revolution in Germany is rising." On October 20, 1917, only a short while before the overthrow of Kerensky, in a letter to various Bolshevik Committees Lenin declared: "In Germany, the beginning of the revolution is evident, particularly after the shooting of the sailors." (*C.W.* XXI, Bk II, 69)

At the time the Central Committee meeting of January 22, 1918 was held, the wave of proletarian struggle in Germany approached unprecedented heights. This was indicated in the Bolshevik press. Yet in his speech at the Central Committee meeting of January 22, 1918 Lenin made the following amazing assertion: "If we believe that the German movement can be developed immediately in the event of rupture of negotiations then we must sacrifice ourselves, because the German revolution stands higher than ours. But the crux of the matter is that the movement there *has not yet started.*" (XV, R. 623)

The further Lenin's line of argument is investigated the more mysterious it seems. His new view as expressed at the Central Committee meeting of January 22, 1918 was to *buy off* the German imperialists! "In order to save the Socialist republic a three billion indemnity is not a very high price to pay." (622). He also made this

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

interesting remark: "Of course, we are taking a Rightist turn which is leading us through a very filthy pigsty, but we must take it." (*Ib.*).

Despite all his arguments, or perhaps in some measure because of their falseness, Lenin's position was defeated also in the Central Committee. However, so was the position for revolutionary war, despite the fact that the preponderant majority of Party organizations and Soviets were in favor of it. With Bukharin for some reason throwing his support to Trotsky, the Trotsky formula won by a vote of 9 to 7. "Consequently, the Central Committee on the 22 of January resolved: not to conduct a war, to drag out the negotiations with Germany, but gave no specific directives as to our future tactic." (Ovsiannikov, 623). In essence Lenin scored an important victory, for although Trotsky's stand, on the surface, appeared to be different and even opposed to Lenin's, in reality it was a complement to the Lenin position. It was Trotsky's position, as he himself indicates, that cast into disorder and confusion the forces that clamored for revolutionary war. "In these circumstances, the formula of 'no war no peace' served as an objective bridge to Lenin's position. Over this bridge the majority of the Party, or at least its directing elements, made the crossing." (*My Life*, II, 111)

12. *Subtle Deception at the Third Congress of Soviets*

Lenin's fight to defeat the attempts to put into practice his 1917 pledges and to conquer the will of the overwhelming majority of the Bolshevik Party and of the Soviets was continued at the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets which assembled on January 23, 1918, the day after Trotsky's "bridge" formula had won in the Central Committee. The chief reporter on the question of peace was Trotsky who demagogically reassured the delegates that "We will fight together with you for an honest democratic peace. We will fight against them and they cannot scare us by their threats of an offensive. They have no assurance that the German soldiers will follow them." (Third All Russian Congress of Soviets, R. 70; James Bunyan and H. H. Fisher, *The Bolshevik Revolution*, 506)

The Bolshevik leadership presented a resolution containing a general demand for peace vaguely along the lines of the pre-October agitation, and secured the support of the Left SRs who were against annexationist "peace" with Germany. "The Congress by an overwhelming majority adopted the joint resolution of the Bolsheviks and Left SRs in which, proclaiming once again before the whole world the desire of the Russian people to end the war immediately, the All-Russian Congress entrusted its delegation 'to defend the principles of peace on the basis of the program of the Russian Revolution', i.e., voted for a resolution which gave the Soviets of Peoples' Commissars and the Brest Delegation the widest powers." (Lenin, XV, R. "Notes" 649)

The whole procedure at the Third Congress vividly exhibits the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

narrow limits burocratic centralism reached since the Sovnarkom had taken the reins. Lenin's Theses on Peace were not presented to the Congress for approval or rejection, nor was Trotsky's formula which had become, due to the vote in the Central Committee, the guiding policy for the Sovnarkom and the Bolshevik Brest Delegation. In these facts alone and in the granting of virtually unlimited powers to the Sovnarkom to settle the vital issue of war or peace is clearly seen the burocratic violation of Lenin's declaration "To the Population" issued eleven days after he had become the Chairman of the Sovnarkom: "Comrades toilers, remember that you *yourselves* are now governing the state. Nobody will help you unless you unite and take *all the affairs* of the state *into your own hands. Your* Soviets are now the organs of state power, organs with full competence to decide *all* questions." (*S.W.* VI, 419)

It was precisely during the Third Congress of Soviets (Jan. 23-31, 1918) that the masses not only of Germany but of other countries as well were seized with revolutionary fervor. "At this time, as a result of the influence of the revolution in Russia and the extreme suffering caused by the imperialist war, the revolutionary temper of the masses in the capitalist countries rose to a high pitch, and this found expression in Germany, in January 1918, in a series of strikes and uprisings under the slogan of Soviet government." (Lenin, *S.W.* VII, "Expl. Notes", 480)

Lenin now acknowledged: "We are no longer alone. In the last few days significant events have occurred not only in the Ukraine and on the Don but also in Western Europe. You have already been familiarized with the telegraphic reports on the condition of the revolution in Germany. The revolutionary flames are bursting out with greater and greater strength over the entire repulsive old order. This has been no abstract theory divorced from life, no fantasy of learned people that we, having created the Soviet power, gave an impulse to similar attempts in other countries. For, I repeat, there was no other way out of this bloody butchery for the toiling masses. Today these attempts are already being realized as solid conquests of international revolution." (XV, R. 94-95)

In the declaration of the Congress, drawn up either by the Bolshevik leaders themselves, or, at least under their supervision, the most essential part read: "In the mighty protest of the workers of Vienna, Lower Austria and Hungary against an annexationist peace, in the awakening revolutionary movement of the proletariat of Germany, the All-Russian Congress recognizes the best guarantee against an imperialist peace built on enslavement and violence and masked indemnities. By declaring once more to the whole world the desire of the Russian people to end the war, the All-Russian Congress instructs its delegation to defend the principles of peace on the basis of the program of the Russian Revolution. Long live an honest democratic peace!" (*Izvestia,* Feb. 1 (Jan. 19), 1918)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The situation, clearly, called for breaking off "negotiations" with the Kaiser Government because of its annexationist demands. Such a move would naturally have poured oil on the flames in Germany where the chief slogan now was *Peace without Annexations and Indemnities.* Instead, Trotsky on January 30, 1918 resumed his performance at Brest, while Lenin on February 1, 1918 exactly one day after he had told the Third Congress of Soviets: "We are not alone," insisted at a meeting of the Central Committee on accepting the Kaiser's annexationist demands. A few days later Radek published an article with a warning: "Should our Russian workers' revolution accept the peace demands which deliver the Polish, Lithuanian and Kurland masses to the mercy of German imperialism, that would be not only treason toward our class comrades but would bolster up the tottering power of German imperialism in its own country, would draw the masses of the Allied countries closer to their governments and would give a new impetus to the world war." (*Izvestia,* Feb. 5 (Jan. 23), 1918)

Few statements in history have been as prophetic as these words of Radek's, every one of which came true. Is it conceivable that Lenin, far superior to Radek in knowledge and power of analysis, failed to recognize the truth in Radek's words?

CHAPTER IV.

LENIN DISRUPTS THE POTENTIAL WORLD REVOLUTIONARY ARMY AND NAVY

1. *The Emergence of a Toilers' Army*

If in accord with the sentiment in the Bolshevik Party and Soviets the Russian proletariat were to follow a course of revolutionary war, it required an army, the indispensable instrument of war. An army existed in Russia. Could that army be regarded as a unit of the revolutionary force capable of coping with international imperialism?

The Tsar had mobilized over twelve million workers and peasants. They constituted a mass-base of an immense military machine which had served to safeguard the rule of the Russian landlords and capitalists and secure the interests of these ruling classes of Russia against the capitalists and landlords of other countries.

It was because this huge mass-base broke away from its upper landlord-bourgeois layer that the overthrow of the Tsarist regime was made possible. The soldiers merged with the revolutionary workers of the industrial cities. The first contact was made by the enormous garrisons of Petrograd, Moscow and other centers. The unity of the workers and soldiers was expressed on the first day after the collapse of the Empire in a general Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in Petrograd. The political propaganda disseminated by the Bolshevik workers imbued the soldiers with anti-capitalist and anti-landlord ideology, causing a second shift in October 1917. Regiment after regiment severed all ties with the Kerensky government and lined up in a formidable array behind the Second Congress of Soviets, the authentic short-lived Soviet Government of Russia. When Kerensky's efforts to find a sufficient number of Cossaks to aid him in restoring his authority miscarried, Lenin remarked: "This week all the telegraph stations were in the hands of Kerensky. Vikjel was on their side. But they had no troops. It turned out that the Army is backing us." (XV, R. 25)

Without the backing of the Army there would have been no October Revolution. The proletarian vanguard would have been massacred and the insurrectionary peasants suppressed with savage ferocity. That the soldiers played a decisive part in securing the October victory was acknowledged by Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders. There were about four million Russian soldiers on all the fronts. What proportion of these forces was Bolshevik? The Socialist Revolutionists published figures of elections to the Constitutent Assembly which took place on November 25 (12) 1917. Lenin accepted the figures as accurate and cited them: "The totals are: Socialist-Revolutionaries 1,885,100 votes, Bolsheviks 1,671,300 votes. If to the latter be added the 120,000 (approximate) votes of the Baltic Fleet, we obtain for the Bolsheviks a total of 1,791,300 votes. Hence the Bolsheviks received only *slightly less* than the Socialist-Revolutionaries. In October and November 1917, therefore, the army was already *one-half Bolshevik*. And but for that we could not have triumphed. And while we had half the votes in the army in general, we enjoyed an overwhelming superiority on the fronts which were *nearest to the capitals,* or not too far distant from the capitals." *(S. W.,* VI, 471)

Thus the armed forces were half-Bolshevik when the armistice negotiations were begun in Brest-Litovsk. Moreover, the Bolshevik strength was particularly great among the soldiers of the Northern and Western Russian Fronts. "If the Caucasian front be excluded, the Bolsheviks enjoyed a general superiority over the Socialist Revolutionaries, while on the Northern and Western fronts the Bolsheviks polled more than 1,000,000 votes as against 420,000 votes polled by the Socialist Revolutionaries." *(Ib.)*

Some weeks after the elections the Socialist Revolutionists split into Right and Left wings. But during the elections they were united in one party and ran one ticket. In voting for Socialist Revolutionists most soldiers doubtless expressed their support to those of the Left who leaned toward the Bolshevik regime, not those of the Right, who were supporters of Kerensky and who stood for the overthrow of the Bolsheviks. As far as we know, not a single delegation chosen in the trenches to the Second Congress of Soviets, two and a half weeks before the elections to the Constituent Assembly, expressed itself for

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the removal of the Bolshevik Government. Quite the contrary: "Army after army, fleet after fleet, sent deputations, 'joyfully to greet the new Government of the People.' " (John Reed, 261)

The Bolshevik vanguard of the soldiers, comprising, as Lenin pointed out, *half of the Russian Army* and a preponderant majority on the Russo-German fronts, whose mind was still permeated with Lenin's 1917 programmatic vows of "War against any bourgeois government and against all bourgeois governments of the world" was passing these ideas on to the other half. Taking the cue from Lenin's 1917 articles in *Pravda* and other Bolshevik papers, the Bolshevik soldiers protested against the "outrageous slander" that to follow Lenin meant to accept a peace with annexations or a separate peace with German imperialism.

To grasp the reason for the high tide of Bolshevism at the Front one has to read Lenin's statement in the article dealing with the elections to the Constituent Assembly: "The proletarian revolutionaries from the very beginning (August 1914) devoted all their attention to revolutionizing the Army, to using it against the imperialist bourgeois bandits."

The Bolsheviks fully succeeded in transforming the Army. True, after breaking away from the Tsarist officer caste in February 1917, the soldiers were deceived into electing representatives who attempted to tie them back to the oppressor classes. But they remedied this situation after October. "While during the period February to October, under the influence of revolutionary events, the masses of the soldiers politically matured and became more and more revolutionary, their representatives in the army organizations, on the contrary, threw in their lot more and more definitely with the counter-revolution and parted ways with the masses. While the vast majority of the soldiers supported the Bolshevik Party, the army organizations threatened to wreak punishment on the Bolsheviks and the revolutionary masses who were preparing for a new revolution. After the October Revolution, the soldiers everywhere proceeded to drive the counter-revolutionaries out of the army organizations." *(S. W.,* VI, "Ex N." 644)

2. *A Change of Policy Toward the Army*

By October 1917 the revolutionary proletariat and peasantry viewed the Army as *their* Army. They had confidence in the soldiers in the trenches and were convinced that any military move by German imperialism on the quiescent Russian-German Front would be met with a resolute fire from the Bolshevik troops. This confidence and conviction was expressed by the Second Congress of Soviets on the day of the October Revolution: "The Congress calls the soldiers in the trenches to vigilance and firmness, and it is convinced that the Revolutionary Army will be able to protect the Revolution against all imperialist attempts until the new Government shall have secured

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the democratic peace." (*Izvestia,* Nov. 9, (Oct. 27) 1917; Bunyan and Fisher, *Bolsh. Rev.,* 122)

The Congress officially named the Army "The Revolutionary Army." The Army conclusively established itself as a crucial part of the forces of the October Revolution and by its social composition and ideological outlook felt itself to be and actually was the first detachment of the potential World Revolutionary Army. If any delegate at this Congress had asserted that this Army was useless as an instrument of war to defend the Revolution, that it was weary and demoralized, incapable of meeting the iron test, and had proposed its demobilization and the construction of a new army, he would have aroused a storm of indignation. For everybody would have seen in such a proposal an attempt to disarm the Revolution in the face of the imperialist powers armed to the teeth and the threat of bourgeois counter-revolution inside Russia.

And yet only nine weeks later the Bolshevik leadership through an appeal issued by Krylenko virtually called this Army worthless and announced a decision to build a new army. Using the general mass sentiment for a revolutionary war as a pretext, Krylenko stated: "Before us stands perhaps the grim inevitability of a holy revolutionary war at the Front and in the rear. Under these circumstances the people are confronted with the problem of creating a military force of defense. Comrades! The Army is tired, the Army is exhausted. The old Army, the former Army is incapable of such a task. For this task it is necessary to create a new army, to arm the whole people. The beginnings of such an army were represented by the Workers Red Guard, I appeal to all who cherish Freedom to form such an army." (*Gazette of the Workers and Peasants Government,* R., (Dec. 29, 1917), Jan. 11, 1918; Collection of Statutes, R. No. 13, 202)

Thus, whereas the Second Congress of Soviets had been "convinced that the Revolutionary Army will be able to protect the Revolution against all imperialist attempts until the new Government shall have secured the democratic peace," the Sovnarkom a relatively brief time later announced that this Army, the Army of the October Revolution, now falsely labelled "the old Army," was incapable of this task. Did the Sovnarkom have a substantiating experience with the October Army upon which to base its sudden negative conclusion? Not at all! The first important test of the Army had come in that decisive moment when Kerensky attempted to move a Cossack force against Bolshevik Petrograd. Trotsky at that time put the October Army and the workers' Red Guard in the category of the defending forces of the Bolshevik Revolution and called upon the workers to support these two bodies: "The Kornilovist bands of Kerensky threaten the approaches of the capital. All the necessary orders have been given to crush without mercy the counter-revolutionary attempt against the people and its revolutionary conquests. The Army and Red Guard

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

need the immediate support of the workers." *(Izvestia,* Nov. 11, (Oct. 29), 1917)

On November 9, 1917, when Kerensky scored a surprise victory at Gatchina, Trotsky issued a radio appeal from Pulkovo. In his message Trotsky did not call the Army "the old Army" or "the former Army" but the *Army of the Revolution!* "The bourgeoisie sought to isolate the Army of the Revolution, Kerensky has attempted to break it with Cossack strength. Both attempts were a miserable fiasco. The great idea of the domination of workers' and peasants' democracy welded together the ranks of the Army and tempered its will." (Quoted in Trotsky's *On the Hist. of the Rus. Rev.,* R. 78). The Military Revolutionary Committee headed by Trotsky was issuing bulletins on the progress of the struggle. One of them stated that the whole move on Kerensky's part was "to demoralize our troops. According to our most reliable information Kerensky has only five thousand deluded Cossacks." (Popov, *The October Overthrow,* R. 224; Bunyan and Fisher, 149)

The Military Revolutionary Committee recorded that regiments of the October Army fought heroically: "Battle is in progress in Tsarskoe Selo. Two of our regiments fought heroically but were compelled under pressure of superior forces to retreat to new positions." *(Izvestia,* Nov. 11, 1917). Lenin recognized that the Kerensky counter-attack against the Bolshevik Revolution was liquidated by "sailors, workers, Red Guard and soldiers." (XV, R. 645). Lenin then declared positively: "I consider that any regiment is adequately organized to preserve the required revolutionary order." (36)

A month later and less than five weeks before Krylenko came out with the story that the emerging unit of a true World Revolutionary Army was "the former Army" and was incapable of acting as a defending force, Trotsky instructed Krylenko to send a portion of this Army to the Don territory to wipe out the revolt of General Kaledin. The Sovnarkom's reliance on the soldiers was reflected in its announcement: "The Soviet of People's Commissars has taken measures to move the necessary troops against the enemy." *(Izvestia,* Dec. 9, (Nov. 26) 1917). Manifesting unlimited confidence in the morale of the Army, the Sovnarkom relaxed Krylenko's control over the soldiers stationed in the Kaledin area: "Without waiting for orders from above, local garrisons should proceed at once against the enemy of the people." *(Ib.)*

On January 2, 1918 (Dec. 19, 1917), only *nine* days before Krylenko's official statement that the October Army was exhausted, incapable of defending the new State, Trotsky delivered a speech in which he said: "Let the German soldier know that there is in the world a new Army, which does not have over it a domineering superior, which does not know of punishments and is not driven with a stick. Let him know that there is a Front where every citizen-soldier of the Army is filled with revolutionary consciousness, and what this Army is capable of. It stands in the front trenches of the world revolutionary

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

movement, its banner is the banner of world liberation of the toilers and nobody will tear it out of its hands. Long Live the Revolutionary Army! Long Live the Revolutionary Fleet! (Stormy aplause)." (III, Pt. 2, R. 239)

The Stalin historians, though generally picturing the October Army as worthless, record that a short while after the October Revolution the German generals made a stab at the Russian Western Front but were stopped by the Army: "Several days after the victory of the uprising in Petrograd the German troops opened an offensive at one of the sectors of the Western Front. The offensive of the German forces against the Soviet Republic was resolutely repelled by the revolutionary soldiers. The Army, as well as the whole people, understood that now it was necessary to defend the Socialist Soviet fatherland." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* "USSR," 639)

Trotsky departed for Brest-Litovsk on January 7, 1918, four days before Krylenko issued the announcement that the Army had to be replaced by a new military force. According to a correspondent of *The New York Times,* a dispatch was received by the Bolshevik leadership in Petrograd describing Trotsky's experience en route to Brest through the Front: "As the Russian Peace Delegation passed along the way to renew the negotiations with the Germans, the Russian troops in the trenches near Brest-Litovsk cried to Leon Trotsky, the Bolshevik Foreign Minister: 'Be firm. Don't make a dishonorable peace.' Trotsky replied: 'We did not overthrow the Czar to bow to German imperialism.' A dispatch detailing this and other important facts was received at the Smolny Institute, the Bolshevik headquarters, this afternoon." (Jan. 10, 1918). When the soldiers shouted to Trotsky "Be firm. Don't make a dishonorable peace," they showed beyond doubt that they stood resolutely for a democratic, honest, revolutionary peace.

In the *Theses on Peace* written several days after Krylenko had issued his appeal, Lenin reported that "The British plainly offered our Supreme Commander Krylenko one hundred rubles a month for every one of our soldiers in the event we continue the war." Why should the British imperialists have attempted to hire the Russian soldiers as mercenaries if these soldiers were worthless rubbish in a military sense? Apparently the British, at the time they made the offer, calculated it was worth their while to invest almost a half-billion dollars a month to maintain the existing Army as a fighting force on the Eastern Front.

We have traced the change in the policy of the Sovnarkom towards the October Army to the period when Lenin and Trotsky decided on the policy of dragging out the "negotiations" with the German imperialists.

Two and a half weeks after Krylenko's appeal, the Sovnarkom issued a decree stating that a new army was to be formed. The existing anti-capitalist Army was no longer recognized as such; it was now

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

labelled and libeled as the "old army of the landlord and bourgeois government" despite the fact that this Army had been a major participant in the overthrow of that government. In a prefatory statement to the reorganization order the Sovnarkom declared: "The old army was an army of the landlord and bourgeois government. It pursued two tasks—to guard the class domination of the landlords inside the country and defend their robber interests against the capitalists of other lands. Naturally, with the passing of the power into the hands of the toilers, workers and poorest peasants, the old class army had to collapse." *(Izvestia,* Jan. 19, (Feb. 1) 1918). The word "soldiers" was here omitted. In the Decree itself the Sovnarkom ignored the fact that the Army had given unqualified support to the Sovnarkom regime; it ignored its own recent attitude expressed in the stirring phrases—"Long live the Revolutionary Army!" (Trotsky). The Sovnarkom now invented the myth that with the very overthrow of the bourgeoisie there had arisen the need for a new army and the necessity for junking the first potential segment of the World Revolutionary Army.

3. *The Stalin-Trotsky Slandering of the Memory of the October Army*

The Stalin and Trotsky historians have defamed the memory of the developing Revolutionary-democratic Army. In 1920, writing along the lines of manufactured history, Stalin stated: "The first and most important apparatus of the bourgeois State—the old army and its generals—was scrapped." *(Kommunist,* Baku, Nov. 11, 1920; *October Revolution,* 38). Whereas many years earlier Trotsky had described it in fiery words as the Army of the Revolution, his new version read: "The October Revolution dissolved the Tsar's army without leaving a trace." *(Rev. Bet.,* 209). It was not the October Revolution, of course, that dissolved the Army. In the face of the authentic historical records proving that the Army *was the* armed force of the Revolution, the Trotsky historians, in justifying the Brest policy, write in a note to Trotsky's *Lessons of October:* "The Revolution needed a breathing spell to consolidate itself, and to create *its own* armed forces." (124. Our emph.—G. S.). In 1927 Trotsky in his Letter to the Buro of Party History falsified the past: "We had no army!"

Miseducating the workers for decades, the burocrats of the Comintern and of its satellite Fourth International have been deluding the workers into believing that throughout 1917 the Army at the Front and in the rear had been going through an *uninterrupted* demoralization and disintegration, and that the October Revolution only accelerated the decomposing process. A myth has been built up that before October, and even more so after, the Army was a mass of sullen, bitter, war-weary people, illiterate or half-literate peasants, indifferent to the danger from the German and other imperialists, consumed with the overpowering urge to leave the Front for their respective villages.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Yet in various statements the Bolshevik leaders recorded that the best human force in Russia was in the Army: "The fact that 'the Army during the imperialist War took in the entire flower of the people's strength' (Lenin, XIV, 444) from the very outset put its stamp on the Army." *(Pravda,* Oct. 22, 1927)

The Brest policy myth that the opposite was true has been exposed in these pages; it can further be exposed from another aspect. There is no more accurate barometer of the condition of the morale of an army than mass desertion. This barometer registered a considerable increase in desertions from the Tsar's Army late in 1916 and in the first weeks of 1917. But immediately after the March 1917 Revolution, though the reins of discipline were completely relaxed, desertions virtually ceased. As Trotsky records in the *History of the Russian Revolution:* "Deserting, extraordinary frequent on the eve of the revolution, was very infrequent in the first weeks after. The army was waiting. In the hope that the revolution would give peace, the soldier did not refuse to put a shoulder under the front: otherwise, he thought, the new government won't be able to conclude peace." (I, 263). The soldiers were not aware of the fact that the Mensheviks and SRs whom they supported harnessed them to the imperialist war chariot of the Russian bourgeoisie. Their sentiment as cited by Krylenko was "Support the front, but don't joint the offensive!" *(Ib.).* When the soldiers realized that their wishes for a just peace were being disregarded by the Kerensky regime their morale slumped and the slump was registered by the accurate barometer of desertion. "Soldiers left the trenches in droves," writes Trotsky in *My Life.* "The October revolution to a certain degree put a stop to this," he goes on, "but of course not for long." (II, 106)

In this one sentence Trotsky records two distinct and diametrically opposite tendencies, the cessation of desertion and its renewal. What caused these sharp fluctuations in the morale of the Army? Obviously when the Kerensky regime was overthrown the soldiers expected the Bolshevik leadership to fulfil its pledge to stand firm for a just, democratic peace. And they felt duty-bound "to put a shoulder under the front" again and thus give a moral and material backing to the Lenin-Trotsky regime. With this in mind they stayed at the Front. John Reed records the spirit of the soldiers several days before the October overthrow. He quotes one speaking at a great mass meeting: " 'If you can prove to me that I am defending the Revolution then I'll go out and fight without capital punishment to force me.' " (21). At another meeting a soldier from the Front, while addressing the audience, turned to John Reed and other Americans present: " 'I ask the American comrades to carry word to America, that the Russians will never give up their Revolution until they die. We will hold the fort with all our strength until the peoples of the world rise and help us!' " (29)

It must be borne in mind that during the October Revolution,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

unlike eight months earlier when the Tsar had been toppled from his throne, the soldier was completely unfettered, and there was no authority to order him to remain in the trenches. He could leave at will. *Yet he stayed!* Originally a conscript of the Tsar in the interests of the nobility and the bourgeoisie, he was now a volunteer in his own Army. It was the *idea* of workers and peasants *democracy,* of ardent desire for a true peace that for a time held the ranks of the Army solidly together. The soldiers felt it would have been criminal to leave the Front in the face of a predatory imperialist power and thus jeopardize the struggle for a democratic peace. Their political and democratic activity rose to unprecedented heights. "At the Front went on an intensive work of arranging conferences and congresses which had it as their task the re-election of all organizations at the Front. At these re-elections the Soviet power was everywhere victorious." (Trotsky, *On the History,* 82)

In 1917, when the events had not yet faded from the contemporary mind and the manufactured history of the October Revolution was a thing of the future, both the bourgeoisie and the masses were quite conscious of the true process in the old Army. The Army was going through a process not of disintegration and collapse but of *differentiation.* The officer caste was deprived of power and was isolated and controlled by the soldiers who instituted democratic procedure in their ranks and constituted themselves as the Army of the Revolution with the avowed purpose of serving the interests of the exploited. It was no longer the old Tsarist Army, although it was composed of the same mass of soldiers. Trotsky, early in 1918, before he became a virtuoso at creating political myths, registered this differentiation in his description of Kerensky's attempt to crush the Bolshevik Revolution: "We were isolated from the rest of the country, the telegraph personnel refused to serve us. But the soldiers, who by tens and hundreds were arriving daily with instructions from their regiments, divisions and corps, invariably told us: 'Do not fear the Front, it supports you in its entirety; only issue directives and we shall dispatch to your assistance right today a division or a corps.' In the Army there went on a process as everywhere else: the ranks were backing us, the tops were against us." *(On the History* 73). In striking contrast with the old, Tsarist Army, the Army of the October Revolution was not led by landlords and capitalists: "The proletariat led the Army and the peasantry." (92)

On the Third Anniversary of the October Revolution, at a gathering attended by participants in that historic event, Podvoisky described the mood of the Petrograd garrison just before the overthrow of the capitalist regime: "Military aid to the Provisional Government could have come only over the dead body of several regiments guarding all the entrances to Petrograd already since October 23 (Nov. 5). These were not merely regiments but a union of warriors resolved to do anything in order by all means to put an end to the hated

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

government, to the landlords and the bourgeoisie." (*Prol. Revolutsia,* Oct. 1922, X, 79)

It is plain that when the Sovnarkom slandered this October force as "an Army of the landlord and bourgeois government," when it offered the new view that "naturally, with the passing of the power into the hands of the toilers, workers and poorest peasants, the old class army had to collapse" it laid the cornerstone for the distortion of the history of the October Army.

4. *Who Stopped the Development of the Potential Revolutionary Army*

In the period preceeding Krylenko's no-fraternization order the Army was full of vigor, the soldiers in tremendous masses fraternized with the German troops, conducted animated meetings and discussions, voicing support to Lenin's pre-October thesis of democratic peace. But by the beginning of February 1918 the Army was in a state of unspeakable collapse. While Trotsky was carrying out the policy of "negotiations" the Army was becoming a steadily shrinking skeleton. The trenches, partly emptied in the months before the Bolshevik Revolution, were now either completely deserted or manned very sparsely by soldiers desperately hoping for a democratic outcome of Trotsky's talks with Kuehlmann. In some sectors of the Front the exodus reached the proportions of a wide, endless stream of humantiy flowing into the vast interior of Russia. Regiments, divisions, whole corps were melting away and vanishing as if they had never existed.

What was the source of this stupendous breakdown which has no parallel in history? The explanation offered by Lenin was that the soldiers were overcome with fatigue and were willing in their apathy, because of war-weariness, to accept the piratical demands of the German imperialists. Their leaving the Front he described as "voting with their feet." But this novel method of "voting with their feet" did not convey explicitly what the soldiers had in their *mind.* Why, *precisely,* were they leaving the Front?

In the opinion of General Max Hoffman, the "credit" for disintegrating the Army was due to the German imperialists: "It was only as a result of the Armistice and the Peace Treaty that we succeeded in so disintegrating the Russian Army that it collapsed, and we were able to transfer 1,000,000 men from the East to the West." (*War Diaries,* 230). In this passage one particular phrase is of great importance: "It was only as a result of the Armistice." Indeed, here, no doubt, we have the clue to the source of the catastrophe brought upon the October Army. However, it was not the Hoffmans who made the Armistice possible but the Bolshevik leadership which bartered the principle of revolutionary mass fraternization for a seat at the Brest "peace" table. Trotsky was closer to the truth when he stated after the Brest Treaty had been signed, "Our Party has consciously destroyed the old Army." (*Pravda,* March 21, 1918). Trotsky's admis-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sion, of course, proceeded from the myth that the Army was a hindrance in the defense of the Front. It is interesting to observe that among the numerous correct statements made by the Bolsheviks before October was one which reassured the soldiers that following the seizure of power they would with greater ease defend the Front. Five days before Trotsky made his important remark, Lenin referred to this line of Bolshevik propaganda in 1917: "We were not disintegrating the Army. We were saying: hold the Front; the sooner you take power the easier it will be to hold the Front." (Concluding Remarks at the Fourth Congress of Soviets, March 15, 1918; XV, R. 180)

Lenin by his Brest policy negated this truth and consciously destroyed the Army. His colleague, Trotsky, while revealing the fact that the wiping out of the "old Army" was deliberate, did not disclose the motives involved.

Considered in chronological order, unquestionably the first major factor in breaking the morale of the Army was the severing of the revolutionary-internationalist fraternization bond. Then came the tedious, cold, depressing weeks of the dragged-out "negotiations" which never went beyond the talking stage, with their regular and numerous interruptions, resumptions, adjournments, postponements and renewals, covering the same ground again and again, incessant, monotonous. The peasant soldiers, and the workers too, might have been inured to the hardships of the trenches but it was impossible for them to endure the unbearable strain of the unprecedented, seemingly interminable psychological ordeal such as no soldier ever experienced, which continued deep into the Winter of 1917-1918.

Having been nurtured on revolutionary principles, many Bolshevik soldiers very likely felt that with the conclusion of the truce the Army was not being allowed to play its rightful role in formulating the policy on the issue of war or peace. They undoubtedly remembered the Bolshevik democratic attitude towards the soldiers during the Kerensky regime. "Let the Russian soldiers at the front vote in every military unit, in every regiment, in every company, whether they wish the war thus to be prolonged by the capitalists." (Lenin, *C. W.* XX, Bk II, 403). In June 1917 Trotsky in a speech at the First Congress of the Soviets had insisted that the Army be allowed to discuss the question of the offensive which had been decided upon by the Kerensky regime: "Only bourgeois philistines can think that if the question of the offensive will be offered for the discussion to the entire army, it will undermine its discipline and will weaken its offensive spirit." *(Wks.* III, Pt. I, R. 127)

But now under the Sovnarkom regime, though the soldiers were just as concerned over the issue of revolutionary war or annexationist peace as they had been under Kerensky over the question of the offensive, the Bolshevik leadership did not employ the simple democratic device of consulting the Army. And despite the fact that on January 7, 1918 the soldiers cried to Trotsky "Be firm. Don't make a dishonor-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

able peace," Lenin on January 20, in his Theses on Peace, asserted that the mood prevailing in the Army was for accepting the annexationist demands of the German Imperialists. "There is no doubt whatsoever that the peasant majority of our Army at this moment would definitely come out for a peace of annexation rather than for an immediate revolutionary war."

Yet despite this bold statement which seems to indicate that Lenin firmly believed that there was "no doubt whatsoever," he presented a question to the all-Army Congress on Demobilization of the Army: "If the Army could vote, would it express itself for immediate peace on annexationist (the loss of all occupied regions) and economically extremely hard conditions for Russia, or would it vote for an extreme straining of energy for a revolutionary war, i.e. resistance to the Germans." *(Notes of Lenin's Institute,* II, R. 42). By the very wording of the question "If the Army could vote" Lenin inadvertently divulged that the Sovnarkom did not allow the soldiers to express their opinion by vote on the vital issue: revolutionary war or annexationist "peace."

Kerensky never introduced such democratic "shenanigans" as allowing the soldiers to discuss the question of the offensive because he knew they would overwhelmingly vote against it. It is significant that Lenin too did not ascertain the exact mood of the peasant majority in the Army through the democratic principle he and Trotsky had advocated so vociferously on the eve of the Kerensky offensive.

Lenin, as has been shown, faced the opposition of nearly all the Soviets and the majority of the Bolshevik Party. Undoubtedly, had he democratically submitted to the Army the proposition of accepting a robber imperialist "peace" this proposition would have been overwhelmingly rejected. If he really were certain that the soldiers in their majority would approve the policy of capitulation rather than of fighting a revolutionary war, he would have given them the opportunity to vote on the issue and would have been then victor in the intra-Party dispute, and the crisis would have subsided at once. But Lenin acted otherwise. And insisting, despite all facts to the contrary, that his Theses on Peace accurately reflected the sentiment of the soldiers, he stated: "With the full democratization of the army to conduct a war against the will of the majority of the soldiers would be an adventure." That "full democratization of the army" after the arbitrary appointment of Krylenko, after the arbitrary, burocratic disruption of revolutionary fraternization and the withholding of the democratic measure of letting the soldiers themselves speak up on the issue of revolutionary war, was far from being *full* indeed!

In March 1917, after the overthrow of the monarchy, Trotsky had declared: "The Revolutionary army—that is who will say the decisive word in the events of the revolution!" (III, Part I, 6). And indeed up to October and especially immediately after, the Army placed its stamp upon the major events of the period. "During the first

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

period soldiers' Soviets ruled side by side with workers' Soviets, and often elbowed them aside." (Trotsky, *The Soviet Union and the Fourth International,* 9). On November 11, 1917 Pravda declared that the Army was one of the component parts of the Bolshevik revolution: "Our coalition, the one which we concluded, is the coalition of the revolutionary Party of the proletariat with the Revolutionary Army and the poor peasants."

But following the Sovnarkom's appointment of Krylenko, the potential Revolutionary Army was politically blocked from uttering any word, for or against, in the vital matter of bowing to the predatory imperialists of Germany.

There is one factor in the army system without which no army can be an effective weapon. It is the policy of making every soldier and civilian feel that the Army is a respected institution, the defender and protector of the country. During a war this feeling is cultivated to the highest degree. The Army becomes the most exalted organization in the State and is regarded with profound affection. This policy is consciously pursued by the ruling class toward individual soldiers. They are given numerous privileges, are showered with gifts, entertainments. Imbued with a deep sense of carrying out a responsible mission, feeling that the entire populace backs them in their war effort, the soldiers are often capable of achieving seeming impossibilities.

With regard to the developing unit of the potential World Revolutionary Army, the Sovnarkom in the course of the Brest "negotiations" introduced the very opposite policy. One of the severest blows to the morale of the soldiers at the Front was the introduction of a psychology of prostration, of uselessness, of being a dead load on the shoulders of the masses. Thus to the soldier's mental strain caused by the dreary months of "peace negotiations" was added the painful humiliation of being considered spent, worn out, of having become an encumbrance.

"Before building the new Red Army it was necessary to get rid of the old. The Soviet power and its military organs took all measures toward most rapid demobilization and decomposition of the sections of the old army. The work of the People's Commissariat of War—the chief military organ of the Soviet Republic, at first consisted in the main, in dispersing the old army and getting hold of its apparatus." (B. Tal, *Istoria Krasnoi Armii,* 34)

Directed into a fixed channel by the Lenin-Trotsky policies, the affairs at the Front took their "normal" course. Life becoming utterly meaningless in the trenches, the soldiers, aimlessly adrift in their immediate outlook, could see no reason for staying until the official machinery for demobilization was set in motion. Totally dispirited, having never been allowed by Lenin and Trotsky to vote on the issue with their hands, the men in vast numbers were "voting with their feet" from the Front—because, Lenin said, they were *"war-weary."* Not many days later these "war-weary" workers and peasants were being

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

mobilized into a "Red Army" operated by appointed burocrats directly under Trotsky. The ideological factor of affection, dignity and support was now applied with zeal. Enduring material hardships immeasurably more severe than they had experienced on the Russian-German Front during the imperialist war, these very same "exhausted," "war-weary" men subsequently fought on fourteen different fronts for almost three years and accomplished what seemed the impossible. They defeated vast forces of Russian and international imperialism.

5. *"We Ourselves"*

"General Knox in his memoirs tells of the pre-history of Order No. 1. A deputation of Petrograd soldiers arrived to the Provisional Committee of the State Duma requesting that it issue some sort of a decision to establish regimental committees and other measures strengthening the revolution. To the reply of the Committee that the time for such decisions was chosen unapropos, a soldier turned on his heels, saying 'That much the better. We will write the order ourselves.' 'We ourselves'—became from the very first days of the revolution the organizing principle of the soldier masses." *(Pravda,* Oct. 22, 1927)

The Army whose soldiers were imbued with the self-reliant, democratic spirit expressed in the motto "We ourselves" could have never been bridled by a burocracy. The Sovnarkom had to disband this Army and build its own armed force completely saddled with appointed burocrats.

6. *The Liquidation of the First Unit of a Potential World Revolutionary Fleet*

What is obvious in the case of the Army when the vital facts are brought together is glaring in the case of the Fleet. The Baltic sailors were the incarnation of the spirit of proletarian revolution and in militancy and self-sacrifice were equal to the best and most advanced workers. Already in the first weeks after the fall of the Tsar they were ahead of the workers of Petrograd and Moscow in the demand for the overthrow of the bourgeois Provisional Government, as recorded by Trotsky. *(H. R. R.* I, 351)

The sailors were ready and willing to die for the cause of the proletariat, and they certainly had no fear of the German Navy, as they heroically demonstrated on October 17, 1917 in an engagement in the Gulf of Riga.

On the eve of the seizure of power Lenin viewed the Baltic Fleet as one of the military weapons *completely* at the disposal of the Bolsheviks. (Letter to Smilga). About a month after the October Revolution, on December 3, (November 22), 1917 Lenin addressed the All-Russian Congress of Sailors: "In the name of the Council of the People's Commissars Comrade Lenin greets the Congress as the army

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

/5.0
CCEPT-

of sailors which has proved itself as the front-line warrior for the liberation of the toiling classes." (XV, R. 41)

The revolutionary caliber of the Baltic sailors is further confirmed by Trotsky: "in 1917-1918 the Kronstadt sailors stood considerably higher than the average level of the Red Army and formed the framework of the Soviet regime in many districts." *(New Int.,* April, 1938, 104). The Baltic sailors resolutely opposed Lenin's line of "peace" with the imperialists and through the Kronstadt Soviet declared for breaking off the Brest "negotiations." *(My Life,* II, 111)

Suddenly, on February 26 (13), five days before signing the Brest "peace," the Sovnarkom issued a decree in which it ordered the dissolution of the Fleet. The amazing pretext for this move was that the foundation of the October Fleet was the Tsarist law of recruiting! "The Fleet, which exists on the basis of the Tsarist laws of universal military service, is to be dissolved and a Socialist Workers-Peasants Red Fleet to be organized . . ." (Decree No. 325, Feb. 26 (13), 1918). If the October Fleet "exists on the basis of the Tsarist laws," how was it that it had superbly aided in the overthrow of the capitalist State, the basis of those laws, and practiced the widest democracy in sailors' ranks? Had Lenin at the All-Russian Congress of sailors on December 3, (Nov. 22) 1917, while greeting it "as the army of sailors which has proved itself as the front-line warrior for the liberation of the toiling classes," said that eleven weeks later the Fleet would be dissolved by the Sovnarkom, and given the "Tsarist laws" as the excuse, he would have evoked a storm throughout the entire Fleet.

What was the sailors' reaction to this decree? Yarchuk, the man who had participated directly in the overthrow of the Kerensky regime but registered a strong indignation at the usurpation of Soviet power by a Cabinet regime, offers the following testimony: "After October the All-Russian Congress of Sailors, in accord with the instruction received by the delegates-sailors from the ships, adopted a decision that the Fleet should not be demobilized, that it should maintain its full revolutionary battle-unity. At the beginning of February 1918 there is issued the famous Decree of the Sovnarkom: the Fleet is declared to be demobilized. There is being formed a 'Red Fleet' on a new foundation—an attractive salary, and the personal signature of every sailor to the effect that his enlistment in the Navy is voluntary. The sailors rejected the Decree. Smolny replied with an ultimatum: discontinuance of issuance of food rations in 24 hours. Kronstadt did not feel sufficiently strong to offer resistance, and the sailors, angry at the new 'revolutionary' power, collected their belongings, took along their arms and scattered to their homes . . . Only later, when the first anger had somewhat subsided, did some units of the sailors begin to return. Many of them concentrated in Kronstadt, but the main force had already dispersed to all the corners of Russia." *(Kronstadt in the Russian Revolution,* R. 46)

Trotsky did not leave the matter of this protest-dispersal rest.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
?_ACCEPT-

He issued an order to round up the October sailors all over Russia and bring them back to Kronstadt. Many of the sailors were caught in this "mobilization" and after a short time staged a mutiny against the Sovnarkom regime. The fact was concealed by the Bolshevik leadership for eight years, and only an inkling of it leaked out in 1926: "About the mutiny of the sailors mobilized in the Autumn of 1918 in the Baltic Fleet there is not a single line in our historical-revolutionary literature. Yet by its social composition and character this mutiny—more correctly an attempt at mutiny—is exceedingly interesting: it was in its social essence a forerunner of the Kronstadt uprising of 1921." (Flerovsky, *Prol. R.* 1926, VIII, 218)

The motive behind the Sovnarkom's Decree to disband the unit of the potential World Revolutionary Fleet, the most militant democratic armed body in history, was the same which impelled Lenin and Trotsky to destroy the October Army. These two forces were immediate obstacles to the Sovnarkom's Brest policy and, fundamentally, were great democratic impediments to the systematic development and consolidation of the burocratic power of the Sovnarkom.

CHAPTER V.

LENIN ADOPTS TROTSKY'S BREST SCHEME AGAINST THE MASSES

1. *Bukharin Vacillates, Lenin Acts*

THERE IS nothing reprehensible in the victory of the opinion of a minority, even of an individual, over the original views of a majority—if the victory is achieved through the free exchange of ideas and arguments and the complete absence of any high-pressure tactics. In 1917, for example, Lenin, almost immediately upon arriving in Petrograd, presented his April Theses to the entire working class. He did this openly in the Bolshevik press. On the basis of a broad discussion in the Bolshevik organizations he gained a majority of supporters in the Party, and eventually among the masses.

Matters were quite different with Lenin's Theses on Peace. Instead of being a direct appeal to the masses, or to the Party membership, or even to the general leadership, the Theses on Peace remained a secret document for some time. Lenin presented this document to a mere handful of leading Bolsheviks at a private meeting. (Jan. 21, 1918). And although this handful rejected the Theses by an overwhelming majority and the proletariat as a whole was for a democratic peace, Lenin went ahead and covertly put his own line for an annexation peace into practice. Exercising a virtually unlimited personal power of appointment and dismissal, issuing extremely crucial private orders and instructions to his subordinates, he was able to ignore the contrary majority opinion in the Bolshevik Party and in the Soviets.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The fact that even the Central Committee of the Party opposed his stand did not deter him during the initial phase of the Armistice from arranging an unofficial "Brest-Litovsk" with the German imperialists in Russia itself. The agreement for this back-stage parley away from the official stage in Brest was concluded by Joffe in a separate supplement to the armistice on December 15 (2) 1917. (*Texts of the Russian 'Peace,' U. S. Government Printing Office, 1918,* 1-7). On December 31 (18) 1917, many days before Lenin wrote the Theses on Peace the German-Austrian Commission of Count von Mirbach arrived in Petrograd and immediately opened discussions with Lenin's representatives on various issues, among them the establishment of postal economic relations between the Bolshevik State and Imperial Germany. Lenin's private "Brest" included negotiations by his appointees with a German Naval Commission headed by Baron Kaiserling to settle the question of the Dardanelles and other naval questions.

For this unofficial "Brest" Lenin secured the services of Krasin, who, as a Bolshevik writes, "did various kinds of special work, often of great importance, such as negotiating the trade agreement with Germany before the conclusion of the Brest Treaty." (G. Lomov, *Lenin in the October Revolution,* 70). The precise record of the talks at this secret "Brest" was, of course, never revealed to the workers. But the few scant facts that were eventually disclosed, such as the above, indicate that even before the question of "peace" was officially settled, before the relationship that was to exist between the governments was publicly decided, Lenin was entering into vitally important economic and other agreements with German imperialism.

Lenin's reason for acting behind the back of the Bolshevik membership and the whole proletariat in these talks with the German imperialists is easy to determine. He could have acted openly only if he had democratically convinced the workers to support him. Because the majority of the workers, the Bolshevik Party itself and the Soviets, were against his policy, he could not execute it with the democratic backing of the masses. He could act either surreptitiously, as he did, or resort to violent methods. This was no idle slip of Trotsky's pen in his autobiography. He repeats the thought in *Stalin.* Citing Stalin's remark that Trotsky's no war no peace line provided a way out of the internal crisis, Trotsky comments: "Stalin's words will become wholly comprehensible if one takes into consideration that throughout that entire critical period the preponderant majority of Party organizations and Soviets stood for revolutionary war and that consequently Lenin's position could only be carried through by way of a party and state revolution (which of course was utterly out of the question)." (250)

Lenin secured advantage from the policy of his opponents on the Left, the advocates of revolutionary war. Although they had the solid backing of the immense majority in the Party, Soviet and State institutions, the Bukharinites followed a course of vacillation, inconsist-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

ency, compromise and retreat. Their line was a grotesque caricature of Lenin's 1917 revolutionary blueprints. The Bukharin group did not make Lenin's abandonment of mass fraternization the target of their fight and did not make the slightest attempt to expose the Krylenko-Hoffmann barter on this principle. The Bukharinites spoke and acted as though no disruption of mass fraternization had taken place. They did not raise the question of Lenin's private "Brest-Litovsk." Yet they controlled the two most important centers of the Party, the Moscow organization and that of Petrograd which included Kronstadt. If they had been *real* proponents of a revolutionary program, they would have put up a stubborn fight at least against the destruction of the October Army. By such tactics they would have naturally clashed uncompromisingly and decisively with the Lenin-Trotsky supporters in the Central Committee. Without the backing of the Party and the Soviets, the Lenin-Trotsky portion of the Central Committe, if it had persisted in its burocratic course, would have had no other recourse than a split and a coup. In that event the whole issue would have come to a head and to an abrupt solution.

Lenin quite effectively brought out the wretchedness of the Bukharinites, albeit from his own angle: "If the 'defense' of revolutionary war, say by the Petrograd and Moscow organizations, were not a phrase, then we would have witnessed from October to January quite different *facts*. We would have witnessed a decisive struggle on their part against demobilization. Nothing of the sort took place. We would have observed the dispatching by the Petrograders and Moscovites of *tens of thousands* of agitators and soldiers to the Front and daily reports from there about their struggle against the demobilization, about the successes of that struggle, about the stopping of the demobilization. Nothing of the kind occurred. We would have noted hundreds of reports regarding regiments forming into the Red Army and terroristically terminating demobilization, renewing the protection and defense against the possible advance of German imperialism. Nothing of the kind occurred. Demobilization is in full force. The old Army does not exist. The new one is just being born." (XV, R. 101)

By their vacillations, "angry" patience and "belligerent" forbearance, the lukewarm Bukharinites actually aided Lenin in carrying through his "peace" policy.

2. *Trotsky's Scheme: a Hoffmann Advance*

In basic agreement with Lenin, Trotsky differed only as to method. Lenin insisted upon signing the annexationist demands without a break in the "negotiations"; Trotsky, at times more perspicacious than Lenin, understood that such an act would have caused an explosion among the Russian workers, while abroad the charge that Lenin and Trotsky were paid agents of Wilhelm II would have been

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
TTP_ACCEPT-

strengthened, with further dangerous repercussions in Russia. The Bolshevik Party was already on the verge of a split; were Trotsky to sign the robber terms in the course of the "negotiations," the split would have inevitably taken place; Lenin and Trotsky would have found themselves outside the Bolshevik Party with hardly any mass followers. Trotsky therefore insisted that only an advance by the German Army through undefended Russian lines could prevent such an eventuality: " 'If the Central Committee decides to sign the German terms only under the pressure of a verbal ultimatum,' I said, 'we risk a split in the Party.' " *(Lenin,* 108). Trotsky reports a private conversation with Lenin at the time of the January 22, (9) 1918 session of the Central Committee. Lenin, it appears, accepted Trotsky's idea of risking a Hoffmann advance:

" 'All right, let's suppose that we have refused to sign a peace, and the Germans reply by an advance. What are you going to do then?' Lenin asked me.

" 'We will sign peace at the point of a bayonet. The picture will be clear to all the world.'

" 'You won't support the slogan of revolutionary war?'

" 'Under no circumstances.'

" 'In that case, the *experiment* may not be so dangerous.' " *(My Life,* II, 111. Our emph.—G. S.)

The basic idea running through this conversation which Lenin and Trotsky concealed from the workers, is very plain: a flat refusal to sign the robber terms; a Hoffmann advance; no revolutionary resistance; the signing of the annexationist "peace" using the Hoffmann advance as a club against the majority of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviets. Ovsiannikov records Lenin's favorable attitude toward the Trotsky proposal at this session of the Central Committee: "What Comrade Trotsky proposes: the termination of the war, refusal to sign peace and demobilization of the Army—this is an international political demonstration." At the Seventh Congress of the Party several weeks later Lenin indicated what had been expected from the Brest talks: "The Brest negotiations had to demonstrate that the Germans would advance, that the German society was not pregnant with the revolution to a degree of breaking up immediately." (XV, R. 130)

Even stronger proof that Trotsky maneuvered for a German advance is contained in his work *Stalin:*

"In the German working-class passionate debates were raging among the progressive layers as to why the Bolsheviks had entered into negotiations and were preparing to conclude peace. There were not a few who voiced the opinion that the Bolsheviks and the government of Hohenzollern were playing a comedy in which the cues were prearranged. The struggle for the revolution required that we make clear to the workers that we could not act otherwise, that the enemies were walking all over us, that we were forced to sign the peace treaty. Precisely for that reason, the German advance was our

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

best proof of the forced character of the treaty. An ultimatum from Germany would not have been enough; an ultimatum might likewise have been a part of a rehearsed play. Quite a different matter was the actual movement of German troops, the seizure of cities, of military property. We were losing tremendous wealth, but we were winning the political confidence of the working class of the whole world." (254-5)

Despite the extremely valuable revelations that are contained in the above citation, Trotsky omitted the *key* facts: 1) the determination of Lenin and Trotsky to avoid a revolutionary world-wide democratic peace and their settled decision to attain an annexationist treaty; 2) it was clear to Trotsky that to sign such a treaty in the course of "negotiations" meant risking a violent outburst against Lenin and himself in the Bolshevik Party and the Soviets and the development of a desperate armed resistance to German imperialism; 3) Trotsky deliberately strove to bring about an advance by the German Army as the only means of inducing the masses to agree to an annexationist treaty.

History teaches that out of political considerations military fronts have often been thrown open to an enemy force. On the eve of October Lenin called attention to this tactic: "Besides, the Kornilovist generals and officers remaining in power will undoubtedly *open the front to the Germans on purpose,* as they have done in Galicia and near Riga." *(C. W.* XXI, B. I., 258). The burocratic course of the Sovnarkom running contrary to Lenin's democratic-proletarian pre-October peace pledges could not but include the tactic of opening the Front and sacrificing a portion of his territory as a means of further isolating the Russian proletariat and safeguarding the usurped power against the danger of the shift of the center of the subjective mass-revolutionary aspirations from Russia to the West, which would have inevitably resulted in a world proletarian-democratic upsurge spelling the end of Lenin's appointment system of individual dictators.

3. *Trotsky Executes the "No War no Peace" Maneuver*

On February 10, 1918, apparently feeling that the time had come to spring his scheme, Trotsky called an end to the time-killing farce at Brest-Litovsk. He read his No War no Peace Declaration to the German generals and diplomats. The fact that he presented it in the name of the Sovnarkom presided over by Lenin makes it clear that both Bolshevik leaders acted in concert. The first and the last sentence in the opening paragraph of Trotsky's Declaration were frauds: "We declare to all peoples and governments that we are dropping out of the war. We are issuing orders for full demobilization of all troops that now face the armies of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria. We are waiting and trusting that all nations will soon follow in our steps." *(Peace Negotiations in Brest Litovsk,* I. R. 207).

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Factually Russia had dropped out of the imperialist war months before because of the revolutionary fraternization which ended the conflict on the Russian-German Front. Formally, of course, Germany was at war with Russia. Naive people interpreted Trotsky's *no war no peace* Declaration as a magnificent gesture which, they imagined, would compel the Kaiser to maintain a state of *no war;* Lenin and Trotsky, viewing the situation with cold realism, knew it actually meant *no peace.* The sentence in which Trotsky expressed hope that other nations would follow the example set by the Russian Delegation was an overt repudiation of the revolutionary way out of the imperialist war.

To this Declaration Trotsky appended a statement in which he repeated: "Orders for complete demobilization have already been issued." Trotsky thus *invitingly* informed the German imperialists that the gates to Russian territory were being flung wide open.

In the citation from *Stalin* (245) given previously, Trotsky showed that there were "not a few" who suspected that he and the Kaiser's Foreign Minister, Kuehlmann, were performing a rehearsed act at the "peace" table in Brest. It is interesting to note that when Trotsky noisily slammed the door at Brest and withdrew, signifying to the whole world that the break between Bolshevik Russia and the German imperialists was final and complete, he left behind a member of the Russian Delegation, General Samoylo. The "break" was neither final nor complete. It is fairly obvious that Samoylo was left at Brest as a link between the Sovnarkom and the Kaiser Government and naturally by agreement with Kuehlmann. We shall soon see the purpose of Samoylo's stay in Brest after the departure of the Russian Delegation.

4. *The Sovnarkom's Criminal Silence*

Having ceased "negotiating," Trotsky hopefully awaited the expected Hoffmann advance which would serve Lenin and him as an ideological shield for signing the German "peace." Meanwhile, on February 14 (1) 1918, four days after Trotsky had left the "peace" table, *Izvestia* reprinted a comment on his closing performance at Brest from the Army newspaper *Revolutsionnaya Stavka* published in Mogilev, Krylenko's headquarters. "The Russian people can now without fear beat the swords into plowshares and return to a free and peaceful life. Nothing is threatening it. Its peace will be guarded by the Socialist guard which is devoted to freedom, and by the German workers holding the barrel of the gun against the temple of Wilhelm. A terrible devastating shot will soon be fired. Imperialism is in a blind alley, the war is at an end, peace has arrived."

This deadly "peace" poison was widely disseminated by the Lenin-Trotsky regime among the hundreds of thousands of soldiers who still lingered at the Front despite all the demoralizing work of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Bolshevik burocrats, and among the tens of millions of workers and peasants.

Two days later, on February 16, while the Lenin-Trotsky regime was lulling the Russian soldiers and workers to sleep with the story that no danger of an attack was threatening them, the capitalist world was informed that the German Command was preparing to send a force against them: "Military operations against Northern Russia are to be resumed by the Germans, according to special dispatches from Holland, which say that this decision was reached at a conference at Imperial headquarters." (*N. Y. T.*, Feb. 16, 1918)

On the day this vital information appeared in the American bourgeois press, General Samoylo, fulfilling the role for which he had been left at Brest, sent the following secret telegram to the Sovnarkom:

"Brest-Litovsk, February 16, 1918. General Hoffmann today gave . . . official notice that the armistice concluded with the Russian Republic comes to an end on February 18 at 12 o'clock, and that war will be resumed on that day."

The Sovnarkom said absolutely nothing to the Russian masses about Samoylo's telegram or about the German preparations. While the Bolshevik leadership thus kept the masses in a state of complete unpreparedness, the capitalist press outside Russia reported on February 17 that—"The German public is being prepared for action by the Central Powers against the Bolsheviki." (*N. Y. T.*, Feb. 17, 1918)

Here was a striking difference in the policy of the Kaiser Government toward the German masses and the policy of the Sovnarkom toward the Russian masses. Both the Kaiser Government and the Sovnarkom required, each for its own purpose, a Hoffmann advance. But the Kaiser Government was in no contradictory position. Its thinly-veiled goal was robbery, and its military leaders made virtually no bones about it. Since the German masses wanted peace with Bolshevik Russia on the basis of no annexations, an unannounced drive against a revolutionary people might have reacted in Germany as a spark to a powder keg. Therefore, the German masses had to be "prepared," even in the short time available before the advance. The Sovnarkom, on the other hand, was in a curious contradiction. Since the Russian masses were for resisting imperialist aggression, the Bolshevik leadership had to suppress all information about the forthcoming advance lest the alerted workers, peasants, soldiers and sailors put up a stiff resistance to the German forces, in which case Lenin's whole policy would have collapsed. Instead of a timely warning, the Lenin-Trotsky regime waited for the Hoffmann advance and told the workers they could beat the swords into plowshares: "nothing is threatening . . . peace has arrived."

With respect to the concealment of the impending Hoffmann action, Trotsky in his autobiography shows how, to begin with, Lenin withheld the contents of Samoylo's telegram from his allies in the Government, the Left SRs, who stood firmly for military defense

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

against German imperialism: "Lenin got the telegram first. I was in his cabinet at the time, where a discussion was being held with the Left SRs. Without saying a word, Lenin handed me the telegram. His face made me feel instantly that something unfavorable had happened. He hurried to close the conversation with the SRs so that he could discuss the situation after they had left." (II, 115)

When Lenin remained alone with Trotsky he urged the immediate signing of the treaty. But Trotsky reiterated his own tactic: "As before, I insisted that we must allow Hoffmann *to start an actual offensive,* so that the workers of Germany, as well as of the countries of the Allies, learn of the offensive as a fact, not a mere threat." *(Ib.* Our emph.—G. S.)

Lenin drew back in the face of the offensive. " 'No,' said Lenin, 'We must not lose a single hour now. The test has been made.' " *(Ib.)*

In recalling the January 22 deal, Lenin said he had not meant to wait for the actual advance but to sign the "peace" terms immediately upon receiving a German ultimatum. Trotsky, presenting Lenin's changed attitude as a misunderstanding of what each had meant originally, explained: "I answered that I had not meant a verbal ultimatum but an actual German offensive that would leave no doubt whatsoever as to the real relations between us and Germany." (II, 116). But Lenin persisted in his interpretation, and sometime later, at the Seventh Party Congress, when Trotsky referred to the conversation, Lenin said: "He quoted here a part of a conversation he had with me, but I shall add that it had been arranged between us that we hold out until a German ultimatum, but that after the ultimatum we surrender." *(S. W.,* VII, 308; XV, R. 144)

Thus, from Lenin and Trotsky themselves we have the record that they secretly juggled with the fate of the hundred and fifty million workers and peasants of Russia, indirectly affecting the fate of the entire world. In the light of this arrangement, whether as reported by Trotsky in *My Life,* or as interpreted by Lenin at the Seventh Party Congress, the *No War no Peace* tactic stands out even more vividly as a deliberate fake. This formula per se was presented to the world as Russia's exit from the war; we see, however, according to the evidence supplied by Lenin and Trotsky themselves, that Lenin planned to use the expected ultimatum as a pretext to conclude "peace," while Trotsky definitely used this formula to bring about a German offensive, which was *war,* as a prelude to signing the "peace."

A very important element, which had to be kept in the dark regarding the forthcoming Hoffmann advance, was the Baltic sailors. They stood guard over the coastal region of Esthonia and could have become a serious obstacle to the movement of German troops. Lenin withheld the Samoylo notice not only from the sailors but even from the commanding personnel of the Fleet. The record of this concealment is found in a Bolshevik book *Civil War, Actions on the Seas,*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

River and Lake Systems (R.). The date that Lenin received Samoylo's report is definitely specified: "On February 16, in Petrograd, over direct wire from Brest-Litovsk the announcement was received signed by German generals, declaring that from 12 o'clock noon February 18, war between Germany and Russia would be resumed." (8). Following this clear setting of the date Lenin received the German notification, there is an equally clear account of the delay in informing the Fleet's Command: "On the 17 of February, the Naval General Staff, not informed as yet about the German telegram . . ." (9). The content of the Samoylo message was released to the leaders of the Baltic Fleet sailors *two days* after it had been received by Lenin, that is, simultaneously with the opening of the Hoffmann raid: "Only on the 18 of February did the Naval General Staff convey to the War Department of the Central Committee of the Baltic Fleet the contents of the telegram of the Directory of the Northern Front containing also the instruction of the Supreme Land Command. In view of this, it is printed here in full: 'Today the head of the General Staff of the Supreme Commander transmitted the following telegram received from Brest-Litovsk from the head of the General Staff Samoylo: "Today, February 16 . . ." ' " (12)

The day after Samoylo transmitted the ultimatum, Hoffmann gave clear indications that the advance was about to begin: "On the 17 of February there appeared the first real signs of the forthcoming German offensive. German aeroplanes flew over Dvinsk. Four divisions had been brought from the Western to the Russian Front. The Germans over the radio declared that they were taking upon themselves the defense of the civilized world against the Bolshevik plague. Trotsky reported this at the February 18 session of the Central Committee which again examined the question of peace." (Ovsiannikov, 627)

The Bolshevik leadership, having received the vital information, said nothing about it to the Russian masses or to the Bolshevik Party. The German Command understood that to the Russian soldiers at the Front the advance would be a complete surprise.

5. *The Question of Destroying the Military Supplies*

It is indicated by Ovsiannikov that the Central Committee did not take up the war issue from February 1 (January 19) until February 17. This means that for nine days before Trotsky terminated the "negotiations" and for a week after, the vital question, for some mysterious reason, was not on the agenda of the highest body of the Bolshevik Party. Even on February 16, the day Samoylo transmitted the Hoffmann notice to Lenin, the Central Committee did not deal with the issue. Only "On the evening of February 17 the Central Committee again discussed the war question." (626). Interestingly enough, the calling of the meeting of February 17, according to Ovsiannikov, was not due to the Hoffmann notice directly but to an inquiry submitted

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by Krylenko: "If one is to judge by the manner in which the question was posed during voting, the motive for the session was provided by the inquiry of the Commander-in-Chief Krylenko who foresaw the renewal of the German offensive." (627). Ovsiannikov states: "No minutes of the session have been preserved in the archives of the Central Committee. We have only the following table of roll-call balloting." (626)

The table represents a record of confusion and inconsistency on the part of Bukharin, of duplicity on the part of Trotsky, contradiction on the part of Lenin, and a conscious violation of the Bolshevik pre-October pledges by all the members of the Central Committee. One of the propositions placed before the body was "For Revolutionary War." Ovsiannikov in a note says: "Evidently the question was put not concretely but in principle." Bukharin, on the pretext that he objected to such a formulation of the question, refused to vote, thus exposing the hollowness of his "struggle." Lenin voted *against,* although in *principle* he supposedly stood for revolutionary war. Trotsky's thesis "For postponing the resumption of peace negotiations until the German offensive had manifested itself sufficiently and until its influence in the workers' movement becomes revealed" was adopted by a majority of one vote, Lenin voting against. Bukharin supported the Trotsky thesis, possibly figuring that a German advance would show concretely how strong the sentiment of resistance was among the masses. The Trotsky proposition of course really meant no resistance for it was merely a preliminary to signing the German terms.

That everyone was maneuvering with respect to the forthcoming Hoffmann advance is seen from the fact that *all* voted for the general, vague proposition: "For resisting in every possible way in the event Germany begins an advance." This motion did not specifically bind anyone to anything and it looked good on paper, which is where it remained, although it was passed unanimously. The policy that was put into effect was Trotsky's, passed by only one vote, to let the German advance unfold.

Incidentally, the true character of this meeting is indicated by the attitude of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and of the rest of the members of the Central Committee toward the revolutionary principles they had enunciated before they placed themselves in power. On the proposition. "Is it permissible in principle to sign peace with imperialist Germany under certain circumstances?" All voted *Yes!*

Among the questions taken up there was one which demanded an immediate concrete solution. Since the Hoffmann advance was definitely scheduled for the next day, what was to be done with the Russian weapons and supplies accumulated at the Front in the course of three years of war? The motion was worded as follows: "What shall our answer be to the Commander-in-Chief? Are we for offering resistance and for the destruction of all the military property and war material in the event of our retreat?" (626)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The scorched-earth policy is a rigorous attempt to impede an invader. Krylenko indicated that the possibility of destroying the supplies and equipment existed by the very fact that he asked for instructions. The very posing of the problem at the session of the Central Committee also proves that it was perfectly feasible to deprive the German imperialists of the rich booty. There could be no other answer, it would seem, than a positive *Yes*. And in that case an official order would have been immediately issued to Krylenko to destroy the huge stocks of war material accumulated behind the Russian front-line. The order could have been easily carried out by the soldiers and workers in time to frustrate the German imperialists.

When the vote was taken on this weighty question, Lenin, the central figure and authority, *abstained* from voting! Lenin's abstention signified that he was *not* for destroying the military supplies. It meant that he was willing, in order to safeguard his position of "peace," to let the German imperialists take possession of the whole mass of weapons and war equipment—heavy and light artillery, shells, railway cars, locomotives, stores of food and other supplies. One might wonder why Lenin felt impelled to go as far as to turn over to the Kaiser vast military wealth. The reason for this was the same that impelled Lenin and Trotsky to keep the Russian masses in the dark about the entire German advance: not to arouse in the soldiers and in the civilian masses the spirit of resistance to German imperialism. The tremendous work of destroying billions of dollars' worth of industrial and military property to prevent the German imperialists from taking it would have jolted the Army out of its passivity. The unchained fury of the Bolshevik soldiers would have sent an emotional and ideological surge through the whole Army and the Russian proletariat. The release of the anti-imperialist energy among the Bolshevik soldiers and workers could not but have produced a profound impression on the soldiers of all belligerent powers. In Germany, though the January 1918 strikes had been suppressed, such a fiery demonstration on the Russian Front would have accelerated the proletarian struggle. Moreover, to destroy the supplies before the advance would have constituted a sign that the German Army was about to march. A different history might have been written by the working class.

It is clear, therefore, why Lenin abstained from voting. To put his policy through, Lenin would not vote for *any* form of resistance to the German imperialists—and was ready to make the Russian masses pay a high price for an official "peace treaty." On the other hand, to vote openly against resistance would have been shocking to his supporters and viewed as monstrous by the Bukharinites. Although Lenin cast his vote for the abstract motion to resist "in every possible way" he abstained on a *concrete* proposal for resistance and by this means registered his opposition to any tactic that would warn and arouse the soldiers and the masses as a whole.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

6. *Hoffmann's Advance*

On February 18, 1918 at 2 p.m. Hoffmann began his advance. The Russian soldiers now learned of the German military movement, but they still did not get this knowledge from Lenin and Trotsky. They learned of the advance when they saw Hoffmann's units moving upon them. Robbed of confidence in themselves, discarded officially even before Trotsky's Brest announcement of general demobilization, spiritually numbed by inactivity and mentally lulled by the assurance that the war was over, most soldiers fled at the first sign of the German move. While Lenin and Trotsky had plotted and knew the date of the Hoffmann advance—"The soldiers could not believe that the Germans would advance after we had declared the state of war at an end. The panicky retreat paralyzed the will even of such individual detachments as were ready to make a militant stand."(Trotsky, *On the History,* 110)

Hoffmann's units crosed the Dvina, entered Dvinsk and rolled toward Latvia and Esthonia. In the south they entered Lutsk making a rapid penetration into the Ukraine. It was not before February 19, a day after the German advance had started, that the Bolshevik press finally gave the Russian masses an inkling of what was happening.

It is of interest to compare the presentation of the events by the world bourgeois press with that by the Bolshevik press. The capitalist newspapers ran the story under huge front page headlines. For example *The New York Times* of February 19, 1918 announced "Two German Armies invade Russia." The Bolshevik press, on the other hand, played down the shocking event in a mere editorial under the colorless, inconspicuous title "A Punitive Expedition" *(Izvestia,* Feb. 19, 1918). Samoylo's telegram at last saw the light of day *(Pravda,* Feb. 19, 1918). But the knowledge of it was of no value to the soldiers now. However, even at that late date it was printed not on the front page but was buried on page two of *Izvestia* and page three of P*ravda.* To the bourgeois correspondents in Russia who did not correctly understand the Brest affair, the Bolshevik attitude toward the German advance was somewhat of a puzzle: "The Bolshevist press has been strangely silent during the last few days and has made hardly a reference to the German advance." *(N. Y. T.,* Feb. 23, 1918)

How powerful—or how weak—were the forces at Hoffmann's disposal? It was known that for months before and after the Bolshevik Revolution the German High Command was transferring troops from the Russian Front both to disrupt fraternization and to reinforce the Western Front. "A million or more German troops had been transferred to France and Flanders before the armistice." records Louis Fischer *(S. in W. A.,* 91). General Max Hoffmann himself testifies that "Until the beginning of March, all the troops that were capable of fighting were dispatched from the Eastern Front to the West." *(War of Lost Opportunities,* 226)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

But even with the Sovnarkom clearing the way, Hoffmann was unable to engineer anything resembling a true military campaign. His "offensive" was the most unique in history. This could be gleaned even from the meagre information that was published in the Bolshevik press. After a few days of saying little about the advance, *Izvestia* on February 22 printed an interview with Pozern, a supporter of Lenin's "peace" policy, who was in command of the Northern Front: "I have received at 12 o'clock tonight the following information: the enemy is advancing in groups of 100 to 200 men recruited from various regiments, indicating that they are volunteers, not regular army units." Later historical records repeated the same sort of details Pozern had given: "Nevertheless, on February 18, the German army took the offensive, which continued until March 2. During that period the German troops, without encountering any resistance, occupied Dvinsk, Minsk, Polotsk, Rezhitza, Orsha, Wolmar, Wenden, Hospal Pskov, Dorpat, Revel, Borisov and Narva. They occupied the towns and railway stations with small units of 60, 100 and 200 men. They captured a large quantity of provisions, equipment, shells, artillery, etc." This passage is taken from an explanatory note in Volume VII, p. 495 of Lenin's *Selected Works,* an English translation from the Russian edition of 1933. But in the Stalinist *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* published in 1939, a full-bodied distortion is given: "The ruins of the old tsarist army could not withstand the armed hosts of German imperialism, and steadily retreated under their blows." (217). It was not the old Tsarist Army and there were no armed hosts delivering blows.

In the interview Pozern said he had received news that many German soldiers refused to obey Hoffmann's order to advance: "A comrade arriving from Arensburgh reported he saw about 70 Germans shackled and led under a strong guard because they refused to cross the ice toward Verder. According to him, soldiers told him that about 70% of the German troops refused to march."

Here was a "war" the likes of which no German or any other general had ever heard of or could have ever hoped for in his wildest fantasies. General Hoffmann in his *War Diaries* wrote: "It is the most comical war I have ever known—it is almost entirely carried on by rail and motor car. We put a handful of infantrymen with machine guns and one gun on to a train and push them off to the next station; they take it, make prisoners of the Bolsheviki, pick up a few more troops and go on. This proceeding has, at any rate, the charm of novelty." (I, 207). The utterly fantastic manner of "capturing" towns by moving peacefully along the railroads is confirmed by Bolshevik sources: "The Germans advanced without any fighting, simply moving in trains along the railways." (Ovsiannikov, 630). General Hoffmann further described the "feats" of the German military: "Yesterday one lieutenant and six men took six hundred Cossack prisoners. Hundreds of guns, motorcars, locomotives, trucks, and sev-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

eral thousand prisoners were brought in without any sort of fighting at all." (206). Indeed Hoffmann met more opposition from the German soldiers who had absorbed a few revolutionary ideas during fraternization than from the surprised and demoralized Russian soldiers.

What a contrast between this situation and the situation just prior to October 1917 when the Bolsheviks had not yet fully wrested the Russian soldiers from the bourgeoisie. The Bolshevik regiments then, to frustrate the German attempt to destroy the revolutionary base in Petrograd, fought valiantly against a *real* offensive by a powerful German army on the Riga front! Even Kerensky's Governor-General Savinkov was impelled to acknowledge the great courage and self-sacrificing spirit of the Bolshevik soldiers: "These were purely Bolshevik regiments that fought with exceptional bravery and lost three fourths of their strength, at the time when similar regiments did not stand up against the least pressure of the enemy." (Quoted in *Pravda*, Sep. 10, 1917)

At that time the fierce resistance of the Bolshevik regiments caused the German High Command to halt its drive because of the realization that it was facing a formidable moral force. Trotsky records a number of remarks by adversaries of Bolshevism who acknowledged the bravery and spirit of the Bolshevik soldiers as unprecedented in the whole war. He quotes from a report of the Menshevik Kuchin, President of the Army Committee: " 'The spirit of the soldiers was astonishing. According to the testimony of members of the committee and officers, their staunchness was something never before seen' " (*H. R. R.* II, 185). Probably the greatest display of revolutionary heroism on the Riga front was made by the Lettish Bolshevik soldiers who bore the brunt of the German attack. Trotsky quotes the semi-Liberal Stankevich, Political Commissar in Kerensky's staff: " 'In the center of the point of attack was a Lettish brigade consisting almost exclusively of Bolsheviks.' " (186). The Bolshevik soldiers were massacred by the withering fire of the German guns. And yet, according to a leading Menshevik, Voitinsky, small remnant of these revolutionary soldiers, in a state of *complete exhaustion*, went into battle again (185). *Pravda* of September 10, 1917, referring to the unbreakable spirit of the Bolshevik regiments, asked: "How can such a situation among the purely Bolshevik regiments be explained?" And it gave the following explanation: "very simply: the Bolsheviks never said that the war could be ended by sticking the bayonet into the ground. The Bolsheviks never agitated to disorganize the Army."

That was true! The Bolshevik policy prior to October was not to disrupt the Army but to *win* the soldier-masses and constitute them as an organized and trained force, to forge it into a Revolutionary Army of the proletariat. But in the Hoffmann "attack" of February 18, 1918, a heart-rending story was to be recorded. A victim of the Sovnarkom's deliberate policy of disorganization, the Army ran—and it ran *not* under fire but long before the "attacking" force reached it!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

General Hoffmann relates: "Yesterday we marched across the ice from the islands into Esthonia. The Bolsheviks ran before we reached them." (206). Lenin in his report to the Seventh Party Congress described the incredible flight from positions which the Germans had never reached and reported that some individual Bolshevik units even returned to the "lost" positions: "We had cases when positions were recaptured that had never been lost. For example, a telegraph operator arrived at the station, sat down at the apparatus and wired: 'No Germans in sight. We have occupied the station' A few hours later I received a telephone communication from the Commissariat of Ways of Communication informing me: 'We have occupied the next station. We are approaching Yamburg. No Germans in sight. Telegraph operator at his post.' That is the kind of thing we had. This is the real history of the eleven days' war. It was described to us by sailors and Putilov workers, who ought to be brought to the Congress of Soviets. Let them tell the truth. It is a frightfully bitter, humiliating, painful truth, but it is a hundred times more useful, it is understood by the Russian people." *(S. W.* VII, 300)

Unfortunately the Russian masses failed to understand that truth because their conspiratorial-burocratic leadership kept it hidden from them.

7. *The Sovnarkom's Desperate Moment*

On February 20 *Pravda* and other Bolshevik papers made public a Sovnarkom radiogram to the German Government accepting the original Brest conditions. Regarding Hoffmann's advance, the message, signed by Lenin and Trotsky, asserted, "The Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia could not expect such a move . . ." Trotsky's expression of a "surprise" was conveyed by correspondents to the world outside: "New invasion was a complete surprise to Trotsky, who thought it couldn't happen." *(N. Y. T.,* Feb. 27, 1918). We have elsewhere cited Trotsky's own testimony that he sought to materialize a German advance. But there is another authentic record indicating that he had actually expected the advance four days before it began. On February 14, 1918 Trotsky made this clear statement to the Soviet Central Executive Committe: "I do not mean to say, comrades, that Germany's offensive against us is excluded—it would be too rash to make such an assertion in view of the might of the German imperialist party." *(On the History,* 109). Trotsky not only did not exclude an advance by German militarism but he even played on the feelings of the advocates of revolutionary defense by pretending that his *No war no peace* act at Brest was of positive value in raising the spirit of the defenders: "What would happen if it advanced nevertheless? To this we can say only one thing: If it is possible in our country, which is exhausted and in a state of desperation, to raise the spirit of the more revolutionary, viable elements, if a

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

struggle in defense of our revolution and the territory of this revolution is possible, it is only because of the created present situation, as a result of our exit from the war and refusal to sign the peace treaty." *(Ib.)*

Commander-in-Chief Krylenko, too, "foresaw the renewal of the German offensive." (Ovsiannikov, 627)

Thus, when the Sovnarkom protested the Hoffmann advance by declaring over the signatures of Lenin and Trotsky that "The Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia could not expect such a move" it brazenly lied again to the masses in Russia and to the workers in the capitalist countries.

No reply came from Berlin, and Hoffmann's advance continued. Now Trotsky, and especially Lenin, became greatly alarmed by the silence of the German imperialists.

Squeezed between the anxiety that the Kaiser might plunge into an all-out attack against the Bolshevik State and the fear that the sentiment of the Russian proletariat for a revolutionary war might become uncontrollable, Lenin and Trotsky, however, differed in degree of apprehension. Trotsky showed less uneasiness about a real German campaign against the Bolshevik regime than Lenin.

Vital hours passed after the Sovnarkom had officially announced acceptance of the Brest terms, still there was no reply from the Kaiser Government. And so, with their power and their very lives jeopardized in their dangerous burocratic game, Lenin and Trotsky, actuated by Hoffmann's "unreasonable" attitude, made a desperate move against the German imperialists. On February 22, 1918, almost a whole week after Samoylo had reported the impending German action, the Bolshevik press sounded the alarm. The jittery Sovnarkom issued a call to the masses "The Socialist Fatherland is in Danger!" In this appeal the Sovnarkom at last decreed: "All the forces and resources of the country shall be devoted wholy to the revolutionary defense." On the surface the appeal seemed to represent a policy of declaring against annexationist demands and for a revolutionary war. Only by giving such an impression could Lenin hope to stimulate the masses to a heroic struggle.

It was when Lenin issued the appeal "Socialist Fatherland is in Danger!" that such information as contained in the Pozern interview was published to show the workers how puny was the "army" advancing against them. Other similarly revealing news was printed. A report signed by three witnesses, dated February 20, was now published after it had been withheld for two days: "The German junkers and landlords are far from using the whole mass of their soldiers in the offensive for they are unable to do this. They are sending in armored cars little groups composed of men of privileged service led by selected officers." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 23, 1918)

Significantly enough, the Austrian imperialists did not dare to participate in the Hoffmann "offensive." Their forces were seething

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with revolt, while on the Russian side of the Austrian Front the Sovnarkom's sabotage in the ranks of the October Army had been less thorough than among the soldiers facing the German lines. Along the Austrian-Russian front, which was of considerable length, the Army was prepared to fight, as recorded in a news dispatch: "The mood of the Soviet troops is calm. In the Austrian regiments there have been noted strong explosions of indignation. We have taken measures to strike back in the event the deceived Austrian troops begin an advance." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 23, 1918)

To the Bolshevik leaders it was clear that the Hapsburg Empire was on the brink of collapse. Speaking at the Petrograd Soviet, Volodarsky, Commissar of Press and Propaganda, stated: "It is evident that the more cautious Government of Austro-Hungary, so terrified quite recently by the revolutionary wave, refused to support the German advance. That Government does not dare, without risking inevitable destruction, to order its soldiers to march against the Socialist revolution." *(Ib.).* Trotsky reported serious friction between Austria and Germany: "The German press has been furiously assailing the Vienna Government, pointing out that precisely Austro-Hungary in the first place should be interested in the overthrow of the Bolshevik Government, otherwise the concluded peace with the former Kiev Rada will remain on paper. We have information from Stockholm that on this ground the relations between Berlin and Vienna are very strained." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 24, 1918)

It was becoming abundantly clear that during the Hoffmann advance the German bourgeoisie was in extreme difficulties. Trouble came from many directions. Discord developed not only within the Austro-German alliance and in Germany itself but even among the elements comprising the force that was marching into Russia. It was reported to the Petrograd Soviet that the bourgeois Polish volunteers participating in the Hoffmann adventure rebelled when they learned that the German diplomats had allotted a portion of territory coveted by the Poles to the Ukraine. *(Izvestia,* Feb. 23, 1918). Yet, despite the dangerous prospect which the Kaiser faced, Lenin's line went no further than a threat. The appeal "Socialist Fatherland is in Danger!" no more represented Lenin's break with the policy of securing an annexationist "peace" than Trotsky's tactic of leaving Samoylo in Brest had represented a real break in relations with German imperialism. The text of the appeal stressed the Sovnarkom's desire to conclude immediate "peace" on German conditions: "In order to save the exhausted and depleted country from new war miseries we made the supreme sacrifice and notified the Germans of our readiness to accept their peace conditions. Our delegates left Rezhitsa for Dvinsk on the evening of February 20, but as yet we have no news. The German Government is apparently delaying an answer. It appears that it does not desire peace." In brief, the appeal, which seemingly called upon the workers to reply to Hoffmann with a revolutionary

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

war, was in reality a desperate gesture to the German imperialists to confine their policy to an annexationist "peace."

Keeping a sharp eye on the drama in Russia Kuehlmann and his advisers realized that the strain they were imposing on the Sovnarkom regime and on the Kaiser's Government might result in a disaster for General Hoffmann and German imperialism. Balancing between greed and reason, Kuehlmann, on the day the Sovnarkom showed its fist and at the same time continued holding out the hand of "peace," sent his reply from Berlin. His communication, listing harsher demands than before, reached Petrograd on the morning of February 23.

The Bolshevik Central Committee discussed Kuehlmann's terms on the day they were received. Ovsiannikov records three questions before the body (633). The first "Shall we immediately accept the German conditions?" was passed 7 to 4 with 4 abstaining. On the second proposition which was abstract in formulation and was introduced by rote "Shall we immediately prepare Revolutionary War?" Lenin, Trotsky and Bukharin united and it was adopted unanimously. The last point, which won by eleven votes against four abstentions, read: "Shall we immediately consult the Soviet electorate of Petrograd and Moscow?"

Only the first proposition which represented Lenin's policy and which did not have even a majority, was carried out. As to the second, which was adopted unanimously, it remained on paper. No Revolutionary War was ever "prepared" against German imperialism, despite continuous pressure upon Lenin in the Bolshevik Party and in the Soviets and despite subsequent intermittent military aggression by the German imperialists. The third decision, to consult the workers of Petrograd and Moscow, was "forgotten" by the ruling burocrats the moment it was adopted.

8. *Some Revealing Light on the "Panic" of the Army*

We are not in a position, quite obviously, to ascertain what precisely happened in each Russian division and regiment when Hoffmann began his advance. The material we have found points to three distinct tactics of the Sovnarkom: 1) orders to withdraw; 2) withholding of definite instructions; 3) demobilization. The result of the first is clearly established in an excerpt from a letter of a commissar of one of the regiments at the Front:

"How the German Imperialists began their raid. (A letter of the Commissar of 582 Solvichegodsk Regiment)

"On the 18 (5) of February at 12 noon two artillery shells were fired as a sign announcing military action. An order was given that the first and second sections should depart. Towards 11 in the evening the Commander of the division issued orders to retreat, scheduled to begin at 7 a.m. February 19. Without waiting for the designated time, several companies that very night moved to Verchovo, thereby creating

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

disorder. This was an insignificant number of less class-conscious comrades." *(Izvestia,* March 1, 1918). Thus a whole division, instead of being alerted to resist the Hoffmann small bands, was ordered to clear the way for them. The same policy was applied to the Twelfth Army, as seen from the report by Nachimson, Chairman of the Army Committee. *(Izvestia,* Feb. 21, 1918). The pattern was followed by most divisions at the Front, indicating that the Sovnarkom's secret instructions to Krylenko were to order a retreat the moment Hoffmann began the advance.

As to the second tactic, that of sabotage, quite revealing is a telegram from Pskov, dated February 22, 1918. Not only before, but even four days or more after Hoffmann's bands had entered this vital region, which was a short distance from Petrograd, the Sovnarkom left the soldiers, as well as the workers, adrift, without giving them any specific directives. "The advance of the Germans is being carried out by small raiding parties which so far have not met any opposition because we do not have any definite instructions regarding this. Thus it was in Rezhitsa, which was captured by a small detachment numerically so negligible as to have been unable to occupy at once the telegraph station which has been operating until this morning." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 24, 1918)

The third method of sabotage, that of demobilization in the face of the Hoffmann advance, is recorded by the Bolshevik press in numerous orders, instructions and news reports. For example, the Commander of the Petrograd Military District, Eremeev, on February 20, two days after Hoffmann had opened the "offensive," issued the order: "The rifle-machine gun battalion at the Peter-Paul fortress is to be dissolved." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 22, 1918). It was only during the anxious wait for Kuehlmann's reply that the same Eremeev issued an order to *stop the demobilization:* "I order all regiments of the region under my charge to be brought into fighting condition forming companies of 250 men each. Until further notice halt the demobilization of the troops." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 24, 1918)

Lenin, as we have seen, for many weeks had been carrying on a campaign that the October Army was rotten, that there was no Army, that the peasant-soldier would rather accept an annexationist peace than fight. Even after he issued the appeal to defend the "Socialist Fatherland" he claimed that the Army was the chief impediment to defense. Not even a semi-orderly withdrawal was possible, said Lenin. "God grant that we retreat in semi-order. We cannot retreat in order." (XV, R. 134)

Facts as recorded in the Bolshevik press itself expose all this as sheer fiction. Despite being surprised by the German advance, the soldiers after the first shock evinced a courageous spirit and a considerable measure of discipline, and in some sections, for instance, in the Twelfth Army, on the second day of the advance, there was *complete* discipline, as reported by Nachimson: "The remaining sections of the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Army are being moved to the rear, to the line of Walk-Pskov. The mood of the troops is spirited and firm. So far complete discipline prevails." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 21, 1918). As in 1917, the Lettish regiments asserted their revolutionary mettle and fought to prevent Hoffmann from moving on Petrograd. "A battle is taking place at Walk. The Lettish regiments are offering courageous resistance. At other points of the Northern Front the retreat is in complete order." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 27, 1918). The Lettish regiments by their valiant action exposed the hollowness of Lenin's statement in the Theses on Peace, published on February 24: "The position of Germans on the islands of the Baltic Sea is so strong that in the event of an offensive they will be able to take Revel and Petrograd with bare hands."

The picture, therefore, presents itself in a fairly clear light. On the Northern Front after the first hours of "panic" there was strong resistance in some places, particularly in the Walk-Pskov region on the road to Petrograd, and orderly withdrawal in other sectors. On the Southern Front the October Army facing the Austrian lines was standing firm. Only in the Center, apparently, was there a panicky situation. But this "panic" evidently lasted only about four days until the Sovnarkom had issued its appeal. On the day it was printed Volodarsky in an address to the Petrograd Soviet stated: "I am happy to inform you, comrades, that the momentary panic produced by the unexpected (?!!—G. S.) invasion of the Russian Soviet Republic has definitely ended." *(Izv.,* Feb. 23, 1918). Zinoviev there and then corroborated Volodarsky's statement: "Yes, comrades, the brief panic has disappeared without leaving a trace." *(Ib.)*

It is amazing that despite the Sovnarkom's persistent endeavors to kill the soldiers' spirit, to discourage them from staying in the Army by repeatedly stressing demobilization, after letting them wait aimlessly on the cheerless Front during Trotsky's tedious chatter at Brest, keping them in ignorance regarding Hoffmann's notice, feeding them on lies so that they could be caught completely off guard by the German advance, the soldiers maintained a degree of discipline, quickly overcame the panic and even struck back at the invader.

9. *The Revolutionary War Sentiment of the Masses Belies Lenin's "Peace" Arguments*

From the moment the Sovnarkom issued its Appeal until the actual signing of the "peace" the Russian masses were aflame with the spirit of revolutionary struggle against the German imperialists. Referring to this period Shelavin, a supporter of Lenin's policy, stated at the Seventh Congress of the Party (March 6-8, 1918): "Two weeks ago *all* workers stood for a Revolutionary War." *(St. Rep.,* 105. Our emph.—G. S.). Commissar Volodarsky, on the day of the Sovnarkom's Appeal, announced to the Petrograd Soviet: "From all corners of Russia we are receiving telegrams expressing the readiness of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

revolutionary masses to fight to the death in defense of the world revolution." *(Izv.,* Feb. 23, 1918)

Again proletarian Petrograd was the center of morale. "The spirit in the workers districts is high. At the plants and factories queues have been formed of workers volunteering for the Red detachments." *(Izv.,* Feb. 26, 1918). The workers were eager to strike at German imperialism and all they asked for was definite instructions. "Today since morning large armed detachments of workers have been converging at Smolny from various plants to receive directives." *(Ib.).* The lead in organizing the workers into armed units was taken by the great Putilov industrial plant: "During the German offensive in February 1918, the Putilov workers organized several Red Guard detachments for the front." (Lenin, *C.W.,* VII, 497). From some plants *all* the workers went to the Front: "Today at noon all the workers of the plant 'Vulcan' in Petrograd region came to Smolny and placed themselves at the disposal of the Soviet power. They are all being sent today to the Front." *(Krasnaya Gazeta,* Feb. 25, 1918)

Regarding the military value of the soldiers of the Army, Lenin at the February 18, 1918 session of the Central Committee had asserted: "Our soldiers are worthless in every respect." (Ovsiannikov, 629). We have already given proof refuting this slander. The soldiers who stayed at the Front were worthy in many respects. Another bit of evidence will only the more strongly confirm this fact: "The first German raiding party consisting of six people reached the Rovenovskoy Station and occupied it without opposition. The subsequent movement of the Germans has been stopped by the Revolutionary Army. In Novosokolnik, Idrin and Sebezh volunteer detachments are being formed. In Sebezh all measures have been adopted to repel the enemy." *(Izvestia,* March 6, 1918). As though mocking Lenin and refuting his slander of the soldiers, the men in some places did not wait to be demobilized and then recruited anew into the forming "Red Army." Since Krylenko had said the "old Army" was not fit to defend the Revolution, the soldiers, to meet the German advance through an organization acceptible to Krylenko, held meetings and decided to convert the *existing,* supposedly *rotten* regiments, into regiments of the "Red Army." Thus a telegram dated February 24 from the Commander of the Narva Staff of the "Red Army" stated: "In the name of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers Soldiers and Peasants Deputies of Narva I hasten to supply the information that among the workers and soldiers of Narva there is a colossal upsurge of spirit. At the meeting of the soldiers of the garrison of the 180,179,178 and 285 regiments and the artillery brigade of the 45 division a unanimous resolution has been adopted to stand up as one man in defense of the Revolution. The entire garrison and the workers have been declared to be a Red Army." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 26, 1918)

Without realizing it, the soldiers in Narva confuted the Sovnar-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

kom by removing from themselves the stigma of "worthlessness" and forcing the ruling burocracy to recognize in them capable defenders of the Revolution. It was here, really, where the first regiments of the Red Army were "created" through the simple transformation of the name. The Stalin historians, though hiding the inner story of the whole situation, mark correctly the date of the birthday of the Red Army: "But the armed intervention of the German imperialists was the signal for a mighty revolutionary upsurge in the country. The Party and the Soviet Government issued the call—'Socialist Fatherland in danger!' And in response the working class energetically began to form regiments of the Red Army. The young detachments of the new army—the army of the revolutionary people—heroically resisted the German marauders who were armed to the teeth. At Narva and Pskov the German invaders met with a resolute repulse. Their advance on Petrograd was checked. February 23—the day the forces of German imperialism were repulsed—is regarded as the birthday of the Red Army." *(Hist. of C. P. S. U.* 217)

The spirit of revolutionary resistance embraced not only soldiers, workers and peasants but also portions of the huge mass of prisoners of war in Russia. A dispatch from Nizhny Novgorod said "A meeting was held by prisoners of war. Speakers called for an active resistance to the advance of Austro-German imperialism. The appeal had a colossal success." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 24, 1918). One event after another disproved every fictitious assertion Lenin made about the spirit of the soldiers, workers and peasants. A partisan war suddenly flared up in the rear of Hoffmann's advance. "Taking part in the partisan war are detachments of Red Guards and soldiers who remained in the rear of the Germans that occupied Minsk. They are being actively supported by the local peasants who furnish them with shelter and serve as guides. The partisans are disarming sections of the German forces, primarily the shock troops and White Guardists. Also there has been received a report about the conflict that has arisen between the German soldiers in the trenches who don't want to advance and the shock troops. It has reached the stage of armed clashes." *(Izv.,* Feb. 27, 1918)

The sentiments of the Russian masses were matched by the feelings of the German workers. Indeed, the workers of the whole world viewed with indignation the robber raid by the Kaiser generals. Even the leading Kaiser Socialists had to pretend to object. The Rightist Social Democratic *Vorwarts,* which had been backing the Kaiser's war policy since 1914, made a show of protest against Hoffmann's advance: "The more we meddle in Russian affairs the more we get away from peace. What must be done is to stick to the defense of our own soil and to make peace wherever possible without annexation or forcible amputations." (Cited in *N. Y. T.,* Feb. 21, 1918). While the Sovnarkom anxiously awaited Kuehlmann's reply, Volodarsky at the Petrograd Soviet sounded a warning to the German

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

imperialist clique: "It is becoming clearer and clearer that the advance of German imperialism is not backed by the German people, that this is an act of a small band of German Kaledinites gone mad from fear of their own masses. And we, comrades, will crush them as we will our own Kaledinites. The sentiment of all Russia vouches for this." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 23, 1918)

Without question the Russian masses, aroused to a high revolutionary pitch, would have easily smashed Hoffmann and would have dealt a death blow to "the small band of German Kaledinites" had it not been for the small band of the ruling Bolshevik burocrats bent on preventing a revolutionary war, even at the expense of curtailment of their own territorial power.

10. *Lenin's "Brest" Argument on World Revolution*

Having notified Kuehlmann that a Russian delegation was being sent to Brest to sign the new German terms, Lenin made a declaration in the Central Committee. The opening words, as the reader can see, contained an out-and-out falsehood: "The absolute necessity to sign the unbelievably oppressive peace with Germany at this moment (February 24, 1918) is brought about, above all, by the fact that we have no army, that we are unable to defend ourselves." (XV, R. 613)

Speaking of the prospect for a revolution in Germany, Lenin said that a possibility existed in that country for Karl Liebknecht to lead the workers to victory within a few weeks! "If Liebknecht is victorious within two or three weeks (this is possible) then he of course will extricate us from all the difficulties." (614). If the overthrow of the Kaiser Government was at least *possible* within a few weeks, then what excuse did Lenin give for doggedly insisting on surrendering to the Kaiser? Lenin's excuse was: he could not promise with absolute certainty that Liebknecht's victory was assured! Unbelievable, but a fact: "But it would be simply foolishness and a transformation into a travesty of the great slogan of the solidarity of the toilers of all countries, if we were to guarantee to the masses that Liebknecht positively and without fail will be victorious in the next two weeks." *(Ib.)*

Such was the amazing change since the pre-October days of Lenin's argumentation. For the first time in their political history Lenin and Trotsky placed as a condition for opening a struggle against a section of the imperialist bourgeoisie the positive foreknowledge of the exact date of victory of the proletariat in the territorial domain of that bourgeoisie.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lla/5.0
\CCEPT-

CHAPTER VI.

THE BREST SCRAP OF PAPER

1. *The Seventh Party Congress*

On February 24, the day Lenin sent the reply to Kuehlmann accepting the new German terms, the Moscow Regional Buro of the Bolshevik Party guided by the Left Communists passed a resolution expressing " 'its lack of confidence in the Central Committee in view of its political line and composition' and declared that 'it will at the first opportunity insist on the election of a new Central Committe.' The resolution of the Buro concluded with the statement that 'it was of the opinion that *a split in the Party was hardly to be avoided in the near future.*' The 'Left' members of the Central Committee, at the meeting of the latter held on February 23, declared that they 'resigned from all responsible Soviet and Party posts and reserved the liberty to carry on agitation within the Party and outside of it.' " (Lenin, *S. W.*, VII, *"Exp. N."* 491)

Lenin and Trotsky adopted an extremely conciliatory attitude toward the Left Communists, but meanwhile sent a new delegation to Kuehlmann headed by Karakhan who on March 3 signed the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Lenin thus secured an additional weapon against his Left opponents by presenting them with a fait accompli and shifting the entire issue from the question of signing the "peace" to the question of ratification. The Left Communists actually resigned on March 3, immediately after they learned of Karakhan's signing act at Brest.

The signing of the Treaty though depleting the ranks of the Bukharinites enhanced their rebellious spirit. On March 5, 1918 the first issue of their journal, *Kommunist,* appeared in Petrograd. It blasted Lenin's capitulation to German imperialism and sought to marshal support for the Bukharin position in the forthcoming test of strength at the Seventh Congress.

The Seventh Congress of the Bolshevik Party (March 6-8, 1918) was the *first* Congress of the Party since the leaders had set themselves up as State burocrats. The Congress was attended by only 46 delegates. In proportion to the Party membership which was "at least 300,000" (Sverdlov's report at the Seventh Congress), it was the smallest number of delegates ever recorded in previous or subsequent Congresses. Almost half of the Party membership was not represented in this, factually, rump Congress—"owing to the urgency with which the Congress met, a large number of the organizations were unable to send delegates in time; and the organizations in the territories then occupied by the Germans were unable to send delegates at all" *(Hist. of C. P. S. U.* 218). The principal report, in harmony with the Bolshevik tradition, was of course delivered by Lenin. To be the chief reporter "Since the founding of the Party had always been Lenin's prerogative." *(Stalin,* 366). Neither Trotsky nor any other

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

Bolshevik leader ever questioned this prerogative which had its roots in burocratic hero-worshipping of "the leader." Lenin covered up Trotsky's and his own responsibility for the Hoffmann advance by shifting the blame onto the advocates of revolutionary war, and he again slandered the October Army by asserting that due to its collapse he had been compelled to conclude "peace" with the Kaiser: "A period has set in of severe defeats, inflicted by imperialism, armed to the teeth, upon a country which has demobilized its army, which had to demobilize. The thing I foretold has come to pass: instead of the Brest-Litovsk Peace we have received a much more humiliating peace, and the blame for this rests upon those who refused to accept the former peace. We knew that through the fault of the army we were concluding peace with imperialism." *(S. W.* VII, 298)

Completely "forgetting" his 1917 revolutionary thesis that "Peace negotiations are to be conducted not with the bourgeois governments, but with the proletariat of all warring countries." *(C. W.* XX, Bk. I., 79) and his declaration on the impermissibility of the workers negotiating peace with the crowned murderer Wilhelm II, Lenin now gave a "revolutionary" excuse for conducting the Brest affair with the Kaiser: "We sat at the same table with Hoffmann and not with Liebknecht—and by that we assisted the German revolution." *(S. W.,* VII, 298)

Guided by the adage that the best means of defense is an attack, Lenin opened an all-out offensive against the Bukharinites. Maintaining silence about the fact that Bukharin had voted *for* the destruction of military property while he himself had *abstained,* Lenin charged: "But now you are assisting German imperialism, because you have surrendered wealth amounting to millions—guns and shells —and anybody who has seen the incredibly painful state of the army could have foretold this." *(Ib.)*

In his general review of events since he took the seat of power, Lenin offered no explanation as to why he abandoned every pre-October pledge and promise given to the workers. He omitted mentioning that the price he had paid for sitting down at the same table with Hoffmann was the revolutionary principle of mass fraternization, the first stab at the heart of the Army and the World Revolution. He uttered no word as to why Krylenko, through the Army newspaper, and then the Sovnarkom itself through *Izvestia,* had spread the tale that the war was over and nothing was threatening the Russian masses; not a phrase as to why the Sovnarkom had not informed the Army and the whole population of the Hoffmann notice transmitted by Samoylo two days in advance of the German "offensive."

After Lenin concluded his report the battle was joined. Bukharin criticised Lenin's dual policy of calling on the workers to fight and of simultaneously telling them their efforts would be futile because Russia was not in a position to carry on a war: "At all our meetings, conferences and congresses, everywhere, there was put forward only

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lla/5.0
.CCEPT-

one thesis that at present no war of any kind is possible. But this thesis puts an end to every war. If you summon a man and say to him 'Go to the Front' and at the same time tell him that 'no kind of war is possible' you are killing that man morally, you are destroying the possibility of any impulse in the ranks of the working class. I insist that the origin of that demoralization which, unfortunately, is observed now among the proletarians is to a considerable degree due to our own selves." *(Sten. Rep.* 46)

The Bukharinites were either unable or, more likely, unwilling to put all the pieces of the intricate Lenin puzzle together. If they had, they could have shown two curiously conflicting facts. One that against the Russian White Guards who had started a rebellion on the Don and in Siberia, Lenin used every available armed body—the Red Guards, the Army, the sailors and even prisoners of war. All of these went under the collective name "Soviet troops" or "Revolutionary troops." The Bolshevik press was replete with news of victories won by this variegated force. Headlines such as, "Success of Soviet troops. Revolutionary troops are eight miles from Rostov." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 19, 1918), "New Victory of Soviet Troops" *(Izv.,* Feb. 27, 1918), were quite common. The Bukharinites did not counterpose Lenin's full use of troops and all means available against the White Guard generals to his "strange" attitude toward the Russian troops on the German Front. With respect to the question of stopping the Hoffmann advance, Lenin disqualified and rejected the Army, brought ideological disorder into the working class by insisting on concluding a separate "peace" with the Kaiser and even rendered inoperative the embryonic Red Army. It was only this latter fact that the Bukharinites stressed at the Seventh Congress. Uritsky, referring to the policy the Bolsheviks had been pursuing, stated: "During all this period we have been disrupting the will of the proletariat to fight a war of defense, we have been disorganizing the ranks of that very same small army which we have just begun to construct." *(S. R.* 51)

Uritsky took issue with Lenin regarding the Army: "However, Comrade Lenin himself is willing to conduct a revolutionary war if we guarantee that a revolution in Germany will start in three-four months. With this very Army he would be willing to conduct a war for three or four months, would be willing to retreat to the Urals if we only gave him a guarantee of the Revolution in Germany. Naturally we could not give him such a guarantee, just as he himself will not give us a guarantee that the revolution will not start presently." (52). Uritsky further declared that Lenin kept the masses in the dark as to the actual road upon which the Lenin leadership was conducting them: "I think that facts speak not against us but in far greater degree against you, Comrade Lenin. There has developed an impermissible situation in that the working masses factually do not know in what direction we are leading them, and more, in what direction we are going." (53)

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
\CCEPT-

Bukharin showed that Lenin's own supporters had admitted the true reason for the retreat of the soldiers before Hoffmann's skeleton army: "Yesterday, Comrade Lenin, I heard from your supporter, Comrade Pozern, who arrived from the Northern Front, that the soldiers, to a great extent, fled because they could not understand the totally absurd position held by the leading circles of our Party." (119)

Trotsky at the Seventh Congress pretended to hold an independent position and at the same time pretended to lean to the Bukharinites. He finally laid his true political cards on the table and gave full support to Lenin's line: "Trotsky, defending the viewpoint of revolutionary war, declared that he, however, did not consider the war possible because of the differences in the Party and the possibility of a Party split, and therefore was compelled to side with the partisans of peace." (XV, R. *"Notes,"* 653)

One of Lenin's staunch supporters, a Central Committee member, Sokolnikov, did Lenin's position a disservice when he said: "Comrades, I had the opportunity to visit the Pskov front and to make observations, and I must tell you that the relation of the two elements, peasant and proletarian, as you imagine it to be, does not exist. It is absolutely wrong to say that the peasants there stand for peace with the Germans, that the peasant element in the subjugation of which we are being accused, expresses itself in favor of a compromise with the German Empire. No. At the Front the relation is such that the peasants, going berserk with arms in hand, fall upon the Germans because the Germans are taking away from them the cows, horses, boots, etc. Precisely the peasant element, infuriated, is fighting the Germans to take revenge for the expropriated horses, cows and boots. We see full similarity of the ideological material out of which develops this peasant, partisan war and the point of view of revolutionary defense: 'Give me back my boots, horses and cows, else I declare revolutionary war.' Yes, comrades, this is the point of view of the peasants who fight for their property, and these propositions are the basis of the theory of revolutionary war." *(S. R.* 75)

The Russian peasants, of course, were not so stupid as to have refused to prevent the enemy from seizing their villages and robbing them. Lenin's argument of a few weeks earlier had been based not on the peasant and proletarian reality but on practical burocratic requirements.

Bukharin utilized Sokolnikov's report about the peasant resistance and continued to insist upon developing the struggle. "When Comrade Sokolnikov tells us that in the vicinity of Pskov there were organized ten thousand armed peasants who are fighting and avenging themselves upon the Germans as they should—this fact alone proves that the movement has begun, that it will be unfolding proportionally as the forces of the German and Japanese imperialists move upon us.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

75.0
ACCEPT-

We have a way out, and this is the only realistic, optimistic perspective." (123)

However, the fact about the peasants having started a mass resistance and arguments for breaking with German imperialism were useless. The Lenin group, supported by Trotsky, constituted an overwhelming majority and, by a vote of 28 to 12, secured approval of the signing of the "peace."

The Lenin-Trotsky regime never distributed the record of the proceedings of the Seventh Congress to the rank-and-file members of the Party. Only sometime after Stalin took over power in the Bolshevik State were the minutes published: "The minutes of the Seventh Congress of our Party are being published after a delay of more than five years." (Foreword to the *Stenographic Report* of the Seventh Congress). And even so, Stalin printed a limited issue, just enough copies to supply a small fraction of the Party burocracy.

The Seventh Congress, as we have shown, represented only about half of the membership of the Bolshevik Party. The Congress was unique in other respects. The decision to call the Congress had been adopted by the Central Committee on February 1, 1918. (Ovsiannikov, 626). There was no regular pre-Congress discussion in the Party press with the Left Communist views democratically receiving adequate space. The high pressure propaganda for the Lenin position is fairly obvious in the pages of *Pravda* and *Izvestia*. Lenin personally carried on a barrage by publishing a sizable article "On A Revolutionary Phrase" *(Pravda,* Feb. 21, 1918). "Theses on Peace" (March 6). Bukharin's publication, *Kommunist,* appearing on March 5, never reached the wide layers of the Party membership as did *Pravda* and *Izvestia,* and would have had no effect even if it had because it appeared the day before the Congress.

Having secured the official approval of their line by the Party Congress, Lenin and Trotsky now had to go through the formality of having the Brest Treaty ratified by an All-Russian Congress of Soviets, nominally the supreme organ of the State. The Extraordinary Fourth All-Russian Congress of Soviets met on March 14. Of 1,172 delegates 814 were Bolsheviks, 238 Left SRs, the rest were Mensheviks, Anarchists and others. The majority of the Bolshevik delegates, as disciplinary Party members, carried out the decision of the rump Seventh Congress and voted for ratification of the annexationist "peace." The division at the Congress was: 704 for Lenin's line, 261 against, 115 abstaining. The abstainers were primarily Left Communists.

The German Reichstag too ratified the Treaty, but the Kautskian Social Democrats, unlike the Leninists at their Soviet Congress, voted *against* the ratification on the basis of opposition to the annexationist peace!

In May 1917, when he had been agitating for the overthrow of the Russian capitalist government, Lenin showed how impossible it was to impose a separate peace on the Russian masses: "If neither the

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

Russian Government, nor the Russian workers and peasants want a separate peace with the German capitalists (our Party, through *Pravda* and in resolutions passed by the conference which spoke in the name of the party as a whole, has repeatedly protested against such a peace) —if no one in Russia wants a separate peace with separate capitalists, how then, from where, by what miracle can such a peace come? Who can impose it upon us?" *(C. W.* XX, Bk. II, 61). In March 1918, by the miracle of burocratic pressure, by deceit and demagogy, by concealment of truth, by ignoring every revolutionary pledge of 1917 and in utter disregard of the will of the Party ranks, Lenin imposed a separate, annexationist "peace" on the Russian proletariat and peasantry.

2. *Lenin's New "Guarantee" for Peace*

Peace was really never established between German imperialism and the Bolshevik State. After Karakhan signed the Treaty on March 3, 1918 the German imperialists continued their war on the Russian masses. A Bolshevik compilation *Krasnaya Moskva,* records: "It was necessary to hold back the Germans who were advancing after the Brest peace." (642). The seeming absurdity of that scrap of paper was pointed out at the Seventh Congress by Kollontai: "Comrades, we see the following situation: a preliminary peace has been signed, but we see that the war continues. And then, comrades, this treaty, if it is signed, will hardly represent anything more than a scrap of paper, which will be signed by both sides in order not to carry it out." *(S. R.* 103-4)

Why then did Lenin, as well as the German imperialists, put so much emphasis on the need of formally signing the document called the Brest-Litovsk Peace Treaty? The advantage to the German imperialists is understandable. In their hands this piece of paper was an immense ideological weapon with which to beat back the rising revolution in their own domain. Furthermore, it served them as a means of augmenting their military prestige. The self-evident connotation of the Brest Treaty was *Victory.* In the West, though the Kaiser's troops stood on French and Belgian soil, the military issue had not been brought to a conclusion. In the East, however, he boasted of a complete military triumph: "The German sword wielded by great army leaders has brought peace with Russia." The Kaiser's boast was confirmed by the official signature of a "defeated Russia."

The Kaiser Government at once put to use the advantage it derived from the scrap of paper. Waving that magical symbol of victory before its dazed and politically disoriented masses and promising an early and "magnificent" peace, the German Government was able to fling its Army on March 21, 1918 against the Allied imperialists in one of the bloodiest battles of the War on the Western Front. Zinoviev, who had supported Lenin's Brest policy, wrote at the end of March

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1918: "Precisely at the moment when we are writing these lines, the telegraph is bringing the reports of the unprecedentedly-monstrous bloodletting on the Franco-German front. Again and again within a few dozen miles from Paris are taking place the bloodiest battles. The flower of the working class is perishing. Tens of thousands of French and German workers are sacrificed for the sake of the bandit plans of Messrs. Clemenceau and Hindenburg. The revolutionary movement in Germany is apparently suppressed. In France on the surface there is the calm of a cemetery. No indignant protests, no signs of an uprising. The situation is such that the liquidation of the imperialist war, which has tortured humanity to the utmost, seemingly remains entirely in the hands of the bourgeois governments of Germany, England and America." ("Instead of a Preface" to *Against the Current,* by Lenin and Zinoviev, R.). Zinoviev, of course, concealed the fact that it was the Brest policy of the Bolshevik leaders that definitely took the liquidation of the Imperialist War out of the hands of the international proletariat.

Many years later Trotsky admitted that "The Brest-Litovsk peace without the least doubt temporarily reinforced German imperialism against France and England." *(In Defense of Marxism,* 27). What Trotsky omitted was the most vital fact that the Brest "peace" reinforced the German imperialists *against the German masses* and strengthened the Allied imperialists against *theirs.* It enabled *all* the imperialists, as Radek had correctly predicted, to bring many more months of agony to the German and Allied toiling masses. Instead of mass fraternization which Lenin in 1917 had declared was inevitable on all fronts, there was a new phase of mass slaughter; instead of a proletarian road to a really democratic peace there lay open the imperialist road to the Treaty of Versailles—the inevitable consequence of Brest.

But if the imperialists, first the German and then the French, Italian, British and American, obtained enormous benefits from the Brest "peace," of what specific value was the ignominious scrap of paper to Lenin? He knew that the nature of the German enemy, like that of all the other imperialist powers, combined greed, treachery and an ingrained disregard for its own word. He knew that there could be no military security at all in that paper. He could not have failed to grasp that his official "peace" with the Kaiser would serve the Allied imperialists as a convenient pretext for military operations against the Russian masses: the hint of Allied reprisals had appeared as far back as the original Bolshevik move for a truce with German imperialism. (Fischer, *S. in W. A.* 21). Why then was Lenin in such a hot pursuit of a paper which could establish no real peace and bring only tragedies to the German, Allied and Russian masses?

Unlike the treaties and pacts concluded among the imperialists themselves, the Brest paper, because it bore the signature of the Bolshevik regime, assumed a legal status in the eyes of the Russian masses.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The paper engendered the *illusion* of peace, although German imperialism continued its war against them, opening the long and bloody international imperialist intervention. This *illusion* of peace served Lenin's plan to tighten the Sovnarkom's grip on the masses, to legalize the system of individual dictators, facilitated his general break with the principles he had advocated in 1917 and brought the separation of the Russian from the rest of the world proletariat—concretely begun with the sale of the principle of revolutionary mass fraternization. The opening words in Lenin's document "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" written after the ratification of the Brest "peace," state: "Thanks to the peace which has been achieved—notwithstanding its burdensome character and its instability—the Russian Soviet Republic is enabled for a certain time to concentrate its efforts on the most important and most difficult aspect of the Socialist revolution, *viz* the organizational task." *(S. W.* VII, 313)

In May 1917 Lenin had presented the problem of peace as a single problem for the whole world proletariat:

"The War can be ended only by workers and peasants, not of Russia alone, but of the whole world. The interests of the workers and the peasants of the whole world are identical: struggle with the capitalist and landlord. Because of this, only united the workers and peasants of the whole world can end the war. That is why we Bolsheviks are against separate peace, i.e. against a peace of Russia and Germany only. A separate peace is a stupidity because it does not solve the root question, the question of struggle with the capitalists and landlords." (Report at the meeting of members of the Petrograd Organization of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. May 21, (8) 1917, *Notes of Lenin's Institute,* I, R. 80)

Through his Brest policy Lenin *divided* the peace problem, one part for the Russian masses and a separate part for the masses of other countries. He no longer spoke of stopping the Imperialist War through the road of fraternization and of securing a permanent revolutionary peace for the *whole* human race. Lenin now said that in the *continuation* of the Imperialist War in the West lay the guarantee for peace for the Russian masses! Stating that the imperialist powers wished to attack Russia, he drew this conclusion: "Under these circumstances the only real, not paper guarantee of peace we have is the antagonism between the imperialist states, which has reached extreme limits, and which manifests itself on the one hand in the resumption of the imperialist butchery of the peoples in the West, and on the other hand in the extreme intensification of the imperialist rivalry between Japan and America for supremacy in the Pacific and on the Pacific Coast." *(S. W.* VII, 313)

Of course, the only real guarantee of peace for the Russian, German and all the other workers was not imperialist antagonism with its resulting slaughter of the masses but a revolutionary road. That road would not only have lead to a genuine world's peace but would

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

have saved countless lives. No one knew this truth better than Lenin himself. Lenin led the Russian masses, and, indeed, the masses of Germany, France and the rest of the world, along an opposite road because he had reneged on his pledges on proletarian democracy and was promoting the power of the Bolshevik burocracy.

The Russian workers were naturally horrified by the resumption of the imperialist slaughter in France and Belgium. But Lenin told them that therein lay the "only real, not paper guarantee of peace." To the economic corruption of the workers which was induced by Lenin's policy of bribing specialists was added the political corruption on the outlook for peace.

By insisting that Germany and Russia had actually concluded peace and the Bolshevik Revolution had secured a respite Lenin used the Brest scrap of paper against the Bukharinites, Left SRs and other advocates of military resistance to German imperialism. With the Brest "peace," as Trotsky testified later, the ideal of democratic centralism received another blow and the centralization of burocratic power at the summits of the Party took on a more definite shape: "When, furthermore, early in March, 1918, the Seventh Party Congress officially approved the Brest-Litovsk Treaty and the Left Essar members of the coalition government withdrew in protest from the Council of People's Commissars, while the Left Communists for the same reason became an organized opposition within the Party and boycotted its Central Committee, the ideal of 'democratic centralism' suffered further reverses, for in effect the power within both the government and the Party became concentrated in the hands of Lenin and the immediate retinue of Bolshevik leaders who did not openly disagree with him and carried out his wishes." *(Stalin,* 340)

CHAPTER VII.

THE DIRECT BETRAYAL OF THE FINNISH, ESTHONIAN, LATVIAN AND UKRAINIAN MASSES

1. *Finland*

AFTER THE overthrow of the Romanovs Soviets sprang up in the industrial centers of Finland and they soon embraced the revolutionary principles popularized by the Bolsheviks. Because the Finnish bourgeoisie was impotent and isolated from the German and Allied imperialists, it was hardly the master in its own home. The Finnish workers, assisted by the Russian soldiers and sailors, overthrew the bourgeoisie, but were suppressed by the German imperialists and the Finnish White Guards. A brief outline of the history of the Finnish "October" and its suppression is given in a note to Lenin's *Collected Works:* "In January and February 1918 all

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Finland was swept by a Soviet revolution. The rising of the workers, begun in Helsingfors and big city centers, was supported by the major section of the peasantry. The bourgeois government, shattered in a number of battles, was forced to flee into the northern part of Finland where it still had influence. All the rest of Finland proclaimed Soviet power. The revolution was unfolding victoriously until it was crushed by the German troops who occupied Finland by agreement with its bourgeois government in March-April 1918 after the Brest Treaty. Supported by the German bayonets the White Guards of the Finnish dictator, General Mannerheim, inundated the country with torrents of proletarian blood, shooting thousands of workers. To this moment the prisons of White Finland overflow with proletarians and Communists." (XV, R. 650)

This, however, is not quite the complete story. The true role of the Lenin-Trotsky regime in the Finnish revolution has been concealed by the Pokrovsky and the later historians and editors of the Russian burocracy. The Sovnarkom dealt the Finnish masses several stabs in the back. First, while they were engaged in the civil war against their bourgeoisie, Lenin extended official recognition to the capitalist Government of Finland. The head of the Finnish bourgeois Government, Swinhufvud, came to see Lenin. Lenin later described the visit: "I very well recall the scene when, at the Smolny, it was my lot to hand an act to Swinhufvud—which in Russian means 'swine-head'—the representative of the Finnish bourgeoisie, who played the part of a hangman. He amiably shook my hand, we exchanged compliments. How unpleasant that was! But it had to be done, because at that time the bourgeoisie was deceiving . . . the toilers by declaring that the Muscovites, the chauvinists, the Great-Russians, wanted to stifle the Finns. It had to be done." (*S. W.* VIII, 341)

Why a leader of the White Guard Finnish butchers should come for official recognition to Smolny, which was supposed to be the center of the world proletarian revolution, is in itself a mystery. Lenin's excuse for shaking the bloody hand of the executioner of the Finnish workers had no validity. If the bourgeoisie was telling the workers that the Muscovites aimed to oppress Finland, Lenin's recognition of the Swinhufvud regime could have never dispelled such propaganda for at that very time *Russian troops were garrisoning the cities of Finland,* and the ships of the Russian Baltic Fleet were stationed in Helsingfors and other Finnish ports. The official recognition of the Swinhufvud Government by Lenin, especially in the period when that Government was engaged in a civil war against the proletariat, was a "unique" method of counter-acting the bourgeois propaganda.

The next stab in the back to the Finnish proletariat came from Trotsky who gave the Finnish bourgeoisie moral support on the question of the Russian troops in Finland. When Swinhufvud's Government lodged a complaint that these troops were aiding the Finnish workers in the civil war, Trotsky's reply was: "Together with you we

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

consider it necessary in the briefest period to clear Finland of Russian troops. But this measure, as you yourself know, can be carried out only in connection with the military technical conditions. We express our hopes that the agreement commission which is being created now will solve all the acute issues in the interest of the peoples of both sides. On our part we ask you to inform us with all the required accuracy of all cases known to you of violence by Russian troops against the Finnish population, in order that we may take the necessary measures in time." *(Izvestia,* Jan. 29, (16) 1918)

In that message Trotsky identified the masses of Finland with Swindhufvud's Government. He labelled the fight of the Russian Bolshevik soldiers against the Finnish White Guards as "violence by the Russian troops against the Finnish *population*"! However, Trotsky usually showed the masses a "revolutionary" face which, as we know, he maintained to the end. When a few days later the Finnish White Guard Cabinet fell, Trotsky addressed a message to the Finnish proletariat: "The news announcing your victory will set the hearts of all countries afire and will give them new strength in the struggle against the war and capitalism. Here in Brest-Litovsk in struggle against the imperialist claims of the bourgeoisie of the Central Empires we feel strengthened by the message of your victory. The steadfastness and courage of the Finnish toiling masses is the best guarantee that you will overcome all the difficulties and will lead your people upon the wide path of Socialist development. From now on new ties of proletarian solidarity are binding free Finland and free Russia. You and we have the same enemies and the same friends, our ideals and paths are identical, our hearts beat in unison with yours. Long live fraternal Socialist Finland!" *(Izvestia,* Feb. 2, (Jan. 20) 1918)

The Finnish workers overthrew the White Guard rule only because they were aided by the soldiers of the Russian Army and the sailors of the Russian Baltic Fleet. The fall of the bourgeois government in Finland sent a new electric spark through the ranks of the world proletariat, already stirred by the 1917 events in Russia.

At the time Trotsky made his exit from Brest (February 10) the German "peace" terms did not contain any demands for a Russian withdrawal of military and naval forces from Finland. Out of the clear blue, Lenin, on the 18th of February, the day of Hoffmann's marching orders and five days *before* the new Brest terms were received, gratuitously suggested the following concession to the German imperialists: "If they will demand the evacuation of troops from Finland—*good and well. Let them take revolutionary Finland.*" (Speech at the evening session of the Central Committee of the R. C. P. Ovsiannikov, 629. Our emph.—G. S.)

Instead of his 1917 declarations of no peace and no treaties with *any* capitalist power, Lenin, who was now determined to obtain a "peace" treaty with the German imperialists, was willing to deliver the Finnish revolution to them for destruction. He was fully conscious

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the fact that withdrawal of the Army and Navy from Finland meant that he would thereby open the road for the German imperialists to enter the country and help the White Guard General Mannerheim to massacre the Finnish revolutionary workers. There is no other meaning in his words. By a strange coincidence the new German peace terms reaching the Sovnarkom on February 23 contained the point that ". . . Finland must immediately be cleared of Russian troops and Red Guards." *(Pravda,* Feb. 24, 1918). Without a moment's hesitation Lenin insisted: "the terms must be accepted." (Ovsiannikov, 632). On the 26 of February *Pravda* published the Sovnarkom's reply to Kuehlmann: "The Soviet of People's Commissars has agreed to the terms proposed by the German Government and is sending a delegation to Brest-Litovsk." The reply was signed by Lenin and Trotsky.

Meanwhile the German imperialists were making preparations to land a force in Finland. A dispatch carrying this information was printed in the Bolshevik press: "It is reported from Haparanda to the paper *Svenska Dagblad* that the Germans have begun preparations to land on the south-western shore of Finland with the aim of clearing the coast of Red Guards and striking in the rear of the detachments struggling against the White Guards." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 27, 1918). Right on the heels of this information, on March 1, 1918, the Lenin-Trotsky regime signed a treaty of friendship and cooperation with Soviet Finland. The Finnish workers rejoiced, believing that the treaty signified that Finland and Russia stood together as two revolutionary countries representing a united front against the capitalist world. At this crucial moment it was fairly plain to some people in the Bolshevik Party, doubtless in other quarters as well, that the signing of the German terms by the Sovnarkom would mean a conscious delivery of the Finnish revolutionary workers to the White Guard executioners. On March 3, 1918 *Izvestia* printed a resolution adopted by the Central Executive Committee of the Troitsk Soviet. The resolution quite plainly declared: "To agree to give the Ukraine to the bourgeois Rada, and Finland to the burocratic Senate, is to cast the Socialist movement of the workers' countries overboard and abandon them to be tortured by the bourgeoisie." On the day this was printed, March 3, 1918, the representative of the Lenin-Trotsky regime signed the Brest "peace," handing over the Ukraine and Finland to the imperialist hangmen.

The matter of Finland was the topic of a violent controversy at the Seventh Congress of the Bolshevik Party, several days after the Lenin-Trotsky regime had signed the new German terms. Uritsky spoke with bitter sarcasm:

"Furthermore, we are obliged to do the following: immediately to remove our troops from Finland and the Ukraine, categorically renounce any official aid to the proletariat of those countries, give up the agitation for a socialist revolution in Finland, Esthonia, etc. We must calmly look on while in Esthonia the socialization of land which

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

we have introduced and in the Ukraine the nationalization of industry which we with so much difficulty are now endeavoring to accomplish will be destroyed. All that we have to witness calmly. Of course, we can organize in the Sovnarkom a secret society of friends of the socialist revolution, naturally not under the firm of Lenin and Trotsky but under some invented name, and conduct an agitation. But this, Comrade Lenin, is altogether different from what our Ukrainian and Finnish comrades are justified in demanding from us, and it is not what can really aid them in the struggle which they are now conducting." (*St. R.*, 53)

Radek at the Seventh Congress refrained from openly branding Lenin's policy as a *betrayal* but his remarks show what was in his mind: "If we sign the conditions of peace and accept them, then upon hearing the call for help we'll be compelled to stand silently by. It will then be said, 'You aroused us to struggle and now you have left us to be torn alive by the vultures of German imperialism.' We'll be hearing how our comrade-partisans are being shot by firing squads, but we'll be compelled to stand silently by. It is not the question of betrayal but of seriously damaging the proletarian movement, for the Germans are already preparing troops to land in Finland. A few more days and the landing will be a fact because very soon navigation will open up." (73)

But Lenin was not to be moved by any impassioned appeals. Having disorganized the Army, having relinquished much territory and huge quantities of supplies to Hoffmann, having made up his mind to give revolutionary Finland to the German imperialists even before they officially asked for it, Lenin at this point was not going to be deterred by words. He had not come to the Congress for a debate but merely for a formal approval of his policy. This approval had been guaranteed before the Congress convened. He had made sure the Brest conditions were signed before the Party Congress. As far as he was concerned, all the expostulations on the fate of the Finnish and other workers was just so much empty chatter.

The Seventh Congress was addressed by a Finnish representative, Ternianen. Whether he was an honest fellow, completely in the dark, or a self-seeking burocrat fawning upon the Bolshevik leadership of Russia, we have been unable to ascertain. Among other things he said: "We feel obliged to thank you for many things: you have rendered us the greatest support. Apart from recognizing, in the name of the principles of the international proletariat, the independence of our Republic, you have most ardently participated in our struggle. Many of you Russian comrades have already sacrificed lives on the battlefields of Finland for the general cause of the proletariat. Standing on revolutionary principles you have come to an agreement with the Finnish proletarian Republic and concluded a treaty favorable to Finland. This proves your international solidarity. This is an example of a Socialist State guaranteeing freedom of the working class. For all

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

this the Finnish revolutionary proletariat expresses to you its sincere thanks. Long live the Russian, great revolutionary proletariat! Hail the growth of stronger unity among the toilers of all countries! Long live the international workers revolution!" (109)

While the speaker talked about the Bolshevik leaders concluding "a treaty favorable to Finland" and asserted that "This proves your international solidarity," a different treaty calling for the withdrawal of the Bolshevik troops was going into effect proving the very opposite.

What was the caliber of the Russian Bolshevik forces in Finland? Two weeks before the October Revolution Lenin had stressed the unquestionably high revolutionary caliber of these troops: "It seems to me that the only things that we can have *completely* at our disposal and that can play a *serious* military role, are the troops in Finland and the Baltic Fleet." (Letter to Smilga, October 10, (23) 1917. *C. W.*, XXI, B. I, 265). Smilga was a powerful figure at the time in Finland. He was President of the Helsingfors Soviet and Chairman of the Regional Committee of the Army, Navy and Workers of Finland. This Committee was the virtual government of Finland, and before October, when Kerensky attempted to withdraw the Bolshevik troops from Finland to break the back of the Bolshevik movement both in Finland and in Petrograd, the Committee disregarded his order. "The committee refused to fulfil the orders of the Provisional Government withdrawing various military units from Finland. Essentially the Bolsheviks had here already established a dictatorship of the Soviets in Finland." (Trotsky, *H. R. R.* II, 280)

Lenin before October recognized the vital importance to the Russian revolution of retaining those fully reliable Bolshevik troops in Finland. In his letter he warned Smilga: "It is obvious that we can *under no circumstances* allow the troops to be transported from Finland . . . We must utilize our 'power' in Finland to conduct systematic propaganda among the Cossacks now stationed in Finland. Kerensky and Co. purposely removed some of them from Vyborg, for instance, fearing 'bolshevization.'"

And to whom did Lenin turn for help in the days when Kerensky, immediately after the Bolshevik Revolution, attempted to seize Petrograd? To the Russian sailors and soldiers in Finland! (XXII, R. 27-29)

Only five weeks before the Seventh Congress, when he had not yet decided to turn Finland over to the German imperialists, Lenin had highly valued the soldiers in Finland and ordered weapons to be sent to them:

"To the People's Commissariat of War, January 30 (17) 1918. Please issue to the Commissar of Finnish railway 25,000 rifles and 30 machine guns required for the protection of the Russian soldiers in Finland against the atrocities of the bourgeois White Guard detachments. Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars. V. Ulianov (Lenin)." *(Leninskii Sbornik,* XXXIV, 14)

But now, in the process of consolidation of the Sovnarkom's power

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lenin gave a totally different appraisal of the Bolshevik troops *who had just concluded the fight against the Finnish White Guard bourgeoisie and had helped to secure the victory of the revolution!* This palpable proof of the high revolutionary standard of these troops was suddenly beyond Lenin's memory! He said at the Seventh Congress: "The Treaty orders us to withdraw our troops from Finland—these troops, by the way, are *worthless.*" (XV, R. 145. Our emph.—G. S.)

A woman Bolshevik, Stupochenko, member of the Petrograd Soviet and of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets, throws some light on Lenin's betrayal of the Finnish and other workers. Describing her reaction to the new German terms of February 23, 1918, in an article "During the Brest Days" she said:

"Next day, having opened *Krasnaya Gazeta* in the morning, I learn that the impudent German imperialists demand all of Lithuania and Esthonia and the removal of the Russian troops from the Ukraine and Finland, i.e. to abandon them to be devoured by the German imperialist beast of prey. I was revolted to the depths of my soul by this insolence. We can allow everything, we can agree to anything, only not to this Judas betrayal of our lesser brothers into the hands of the hangman. And I became a confirmed opponent to the robber peace which threatens enslavement to our border-lands. In this very issue I read Lenin's letter in which he calls upon everybody to agree, of necessity, to these conditions of peace. 'Since Lenin insists, they will definitely sign the peace,' I reflected sadly, 'but how can he agree to such a betrayal?' " *(Prol. Revolutsia,* #4 (16) 1923, 100)

It is astonishing that a loyal member of the Bolshevik Party, in the daily turmoil of those months, without having an objective overall picture of Lenin's betrayal of every democratic-revolutionary principle he had advocated before the seizure of power, could think he was betraying the working class! Stupochenko, it is logical to assume, was representative of this feeling among many Bolshevik workers. On February 24, 1918 she attended a meeting of the Bolshevik fraction of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets. She records a scene the meaning of which she in all probability failed to grasp. Pressed by the opponents of his "peace" policy, Lenin resorted to obvious sophistry and phony tales about "illegal aid" supposedly being rendered to the Finnish workers. In order to whitewash his compliance with Kuehlmann's demand to withdraw the Baltic Fleet from Finland, Lenin said that the Finnish Communists themselves had asked him to remove the sailors. This would have sounded incredible without some "logical" explanation. So Lenin told his listeners that the Baltic sailors, the very men whom he himself had but two months earlier acclaimed as the vanguard of the revolution, who subsequently threw themselves into every dangerous sector in the war against Kolchak and Denikin, who helped to save Petrograd in 1919, were *selling arms to the White Guards!* Stupochenko testifies:

"And now there started one of the most interesting conversations

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

I ever heard. The opponents of peace fired questions at Lenin, one question more acid than the other. The attack was led by Comrade Steklov.

" 'Tell us, Comrade Lenin, how do you think you will fulfil the point about withdrawing our troops from the Ukraine. Are we going to cast a defenseless country to spoliation by the Germans? . . . Is it possible that we will refuse aid to our brothers-Finns and let them perish, abandoned to themselves, in an unequal struggle?'

" 'Yes, we will be obliged to refuse. But imagine, what an unfortunate incident occurred yesterday on the Finnish railway. Several cars with shells by "oversight" of the railroad men got into a different group and went directly to Finland instead of going South. Such "sad" mistakes on the border are always possible. As to the sailors, the Finnish comrades themselves asked that we remove them because they are so demoralized that they are selling arms to the White Guards and are only hindering the struggle for Soviet power.' " (106-7)

One might venture to argue that perhaps among the sailors there were a few who turned scoundrels who sold arms to the White Guards. But Lenin talked not of isolated rogues but of *the sailors in the Baltic Fleet* which he had agreed to withdraw from Finland! His accusation was plainly a vicious slander of the revolutionary element that had played a leading role in overthrowing Kerensky and the Tsarist admirals and generals. Stupochenko quotes Lenin directly. Her article recording his statement appeared in the Spring of 1923, approximately in the period of the Twelfth Congress of the Party. *Proletarskaya Revolutsia* was an official publication of "The Central Committee of the R. C. P. (B-viks) Commission on the History of the October Revolution and the R. C. P. (Bolsheviks)." Neither the Trotsky nor the Stalin burocrats questioned the veracity of her testimony which they published in 1923.

We have noted that Lenin, in order to force his policy through, stooped to the slandering of the soldiers stationed in Finland as *worthless* and the sailors as *thieves* and *scoundrels.* Paradoxically, only a short while back, in the elections to the Constituent Assembly, he had decided to be the representative of these two bodies. "Lenin headed the list of the RSDLP (Bolsheviks) in five districts: Moscow, Petrograd, Petrograd Province, Baltic Fleet and Northern Front. (According to the regulations for the elections to the Constituent Assembly one candidate could be nominated in several election districts, but not exceeding five.) Having been elected in all these districts Lenin had to declare in time which district he chose to represent and which he rejected thereby making possible the substitution for his candidacy of the names next on the list." *(Leninsky Sbornik,* XVIII, 40). Lenin sent the following statement to the Commission on Elections to the Constituent Assembly: "I request to be considered elected by the Army and Fleet in Finland. In the other districts in which I was elected to regard that I decline." (41)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Few points expose Lenin in slandering the sailors as clearly as his order four weeks earlier: "To the Naval Revolutionary Committee. January 15, (28) 1918. Please take speedy measures to place at the disposal of Comrade Ter-Arutunants 2,000 sailors for military operations against the bourgeois Rada. Lenin." (XXX, R. 476; Lenin's *War Correspondence* 1917-1920, 14)

The following further indicates Lenin's estimate of the sailors before Brest: "Generally in the October days Vladimir Ilyitch considered us, sailors, the most reliable military organization and often said: 'I need you, sailors, in the most dangerous places.' " (Vakhrameev, *Lenin and the Red Fleet,* R. 1924; *Lenin in the First Months of Soviet Power,* R. 81)

There was a very compelling reason at the end of February 1918 for Lenin to dislike the Baltic Fleet sailors and their organized center, the Kronstadt Soviet. From the very outset since the advent of Lenin's "peace" policy they not only rejected the signing of a treaty with Germany but opposed his line of opening negotiations with any imperialists. In the Bolshevik leading stratum it was well known that the Kronstadt Soviet never retreated from this position. A few days after Lenin's slander of the revolutionary Baltic sailors, the Bolshevik press reported:

"The Kronstadt Soviet of W. and S. D., having discussed the question of the German-Austrian advance and the conclusion of peace on the German terms of enslavement of toilers' Russia, standing on its previous position expressed in the resolution of January 30 on the action of the Brest Delegation, *categorically declares* that Revolutionary Soviet Russia cannot conclude peace and enter into any negotiations with the imperialists of Austro-Hungary and Germany as well as of England, France and other countries. The only road for the revolutionary-toilers' Russia is armed uprising against the oppressors." *(Krasnaya Gazeta,* March 6, 1918)

Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution the forces of the October Army and Fleet in Finland were of considerable size. "The principal part of the fleet was in the Finland waters, with a total of about 70,000 sailors. An army corps was also located in Finland, and ten thousand Russian workers were in port factories of Helsingfors. That was a good-sized fist of the revolution." (Trotsky, *H. R. R.* II, 53-4)

Even though reduced in numbers by the Sovnarkom's demoralizing policy, there was still a large concentration of Bolshevik soldiers and sailors in Finland during the signing of the Brest "peace." Naturally, if the soldiers, and particularly the sailors, had retained any of their pre-Brest democratic, independent spirit, they never would have left the Finnish masses in the lurch. The burocratic rulers understood this very well. The day after Lenin had stated in the Central Committee "let them take revolutionary Finland" he printed a decree placing the Fleet under the factual command of Krylenko: "To place the guidance of the operational activities of the Fleet directly in the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

hands of the naval staff which in this matter will be getting its general orders from the Supreme Commander-in-Chief." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 19, 1918). Next, on February 26, (13) a decree was issued dissolving the October Fleet and creating a "Red Fleet" with *appointed* commissars to handle the difficult situation among the sailors, many of whom were so embittered by the reorganization that they went home. Following this arbitrary reorganization, on the very day that Lenin's representative, Karakhan, signed the German "peace," the commissars dismissed the previously elected Central Committee of the Baltic Fleet: "Assuming on March 3, 1918 the duties as the director of the Baltic Fleet, the Soviet of Commissars of the Fleet declares nonexistent the Central Executive Committe of the Baltic Fleet and proposes that it hand over all its affairs within three days to the Soviet of Commissars and vacate the premises which it now occupies." *(Izv.,* March 7, 1918)

Having tightened its burocratic control over the soldiers and Baltic sailors, the Sovnarkom carried out the evacuation of the Russian revolutionary land and naval forces from Finland. On the troop removal Chicherin reported to the Fifth Congress of Soviets: "Finland and the Ukraine were cleared of Soviet troops, although the masses in these regions continued a desperate struggle." *(Izv.,* July 5, 1918; Louis Fraina, *Proletarian Revolution in Russia,* 410). On the removal of the Fleet we find a fairly graphic account in the compilation *Documents on the History of Civil War in USSR.* (R.) The main units of the Fleet were removed on March 12, 1918 while the sea lanes were still icebound: "It was decided to move first all the battleships and cruisers despite the ice, and later the destroyers and other ships whose weaker bulk could not withstand the trip through the ice . . . The ice was even, solid, one foot thick, the temperature during the entire trip was generally below zero." (I, 114). Attention must be called to the significant fact that the Brest Treaty, Article 6 allowed a certain time lattitude for the removal of the Fleet: "So long as the ice excludes the bringing of Russian warships to Russian ports only small detachments will remain behind on the warships." (Magnus, 170). Instead of delaying for the opening of navigation and meanwhile leaving some sailors on warships in Finland, as the Treaty provided, Lenin posthaste had the heavy ships crash through the ice and out of Finland even before the Fourth Congress of Soviets ratified the Brest Treaty. Is it difficult to see the purpose behind this haste? Lenin required a wide interval betwen the departure of the *main body* of the Fleet and the arrival of the German troop-ships. This was done at the cost of damage to the ships. *(Documents* etc.)

Once the ships of the line had been removed, the militant mood on the rest of the vessels could never endure. The German military transports arrived in Finland while the rest of the Baltic Fleet was leaving Helsingfors. On April 5, 1918 "The last ships were departing when in the environs of the city the battle was raging, the rattle of

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

machine guns and artillery firing was clearly audible." *(Documents,* 116)

And now that the inside story has been unveiled let the reader go back a few pages to the Bolshevik description of the results of Lenin's "let them take revolutionary Finland." As we have cited at the beginning of this chapter, Kamenev, the editor of Lenin's *Collected Works,* wrote: "Supported by the German bayonets the White Guards of the Finnish Dictator, General Mannerheim, inundated the country with torrents of proletarian blood, shooting thousands of workers. To this moment (1922—G. S.) the prisons of White Finland overflow with proletarians and Communists." (XV, R. 650)

The deeper one delves into this monstrous case the clearer one sees that the burocrat who perpetrated the destruction of the proletarian vanguard of Finland did so *premeditatedly.* Be it recalled that on March 1, 1918 Lenin concluded a treaty with "the proletarian government of Finland" as he himself designated the Finnish regime then in power (288). This treaty was not merely an expression of platonic friendship but definitely bore the character of an agreement for mutual military defense: "Concluding a treaty with the proletarian government of Finland, we the representatives of Socialist Russia recognized the full right of Finland to its territory, but, with the consent of both governments, Fort Ino was given to Russia 'for the mutual interests of the Socialist Republics,' as stated in the concluded treaty. Naturally, the bourgeoisie of Finland could not have refrained from raising a riot on account of this point and made claims on Fort Ino." *(Ib.).* On March 3, 1918, two days after Lenin concluded this treaty, Karakhan, immediately before signing the Brest "peace," issued a statement which, among other things, announced: "Germany is furthermore occupying by force of arms regions with a purely Russian population, is establishing there a regime of military occupation, and is restoring the pre-revolutionary order. In the Ukraine and in Finland, Germany demands non-interference of revolutionary Russia and at the same time actively assists the counter-revolutionary forces against the revolutionary workers and peasants." *(Peace Neg. at Brest-Litovsk,* R. 230). Lenin, therefore, knew well just what was going to happen to the revolutionary workers of the Ukraine and Finland when he accepted the German conditions. While preserving the appearance of friendship and mutual assistance towards "the proletarian government of Finland," Lenin consciously agreed to the replacement of this regime with the White Guard regime of Swinhufvud and Mannerheim. In the Brest Treaty itself, Lenin obligated himself to conclude agreements with the ousted White Guard regime on concrete matters such as the issue of the Aland Islands. Article 6 of the Brest Treaty reads: "Russia is to cease all agitation or propaganda against the Government or the public institutions of Finland. The fortifications erected on the Aland Islands are to be removed with all possible dispatch. A special agreement is to be made between Germany, Russia, Finland and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Sweden regarding the permanent non-fortification of these islands, as well as regarding their treatment in military, shipping and technical respects."

In short, long before the White Guard government of Finland was restored to power by German imperialism Lenin had consented to give it what was tantamount to de jure recognition. By agreeing to the German conditions he gave sanction to the removal of the Bolshevik regime of Finland and the extermination of the Finnish proletarian vanguard. All this had been encompassed by secret thesis he had presented at the February 18, 1918 session of the Central Committee: "If they will demand the withdrawal of troops from Finland—good and well, let them take revolutionary Finland."

There is undoubtedly a moment in the life of most criminals when they undergo emotional turmoil before committing their first major crime. When Lenin learned of the landing of German troops in Finland he was, according to Trotsky's record, extremely agitated. The course upon which he had embarked evoked in him, as the chief architect of the capitulation policy, a deep emotional crisis—as it probably did in Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and others who supported him. For men who only yesterday had advocated an opposite policy, it must have been an extremely violent crisis. Lenin actually wavered a moment, according to Trotsky:

"The developments in the Ukraine and Finland tipped the scale strongly in favor of war. Every hour brought something unfavorable. The news of a German landing in Finland and of the routing of the Finnish workers reached us. I met Lenin in the corridor near his cabinet. He was terribly excited; never before had I seen him like that, nor did I again.

" 'Yes, we shall have to fight,' he said, 'though we have nothing to fight with. There does not seem to be any other way out.'

"But ten or fifteen minutes later, when I called at his cabinet, he said: 'No, we must not change our policy . . .' " *(My Life,* II, 117)

If the testimony is accurate, Lenin wavered only a brief moment. It was not the landing per se of the German hangman-expedition that shook him up. He had understood very well that once he agreed to give Finland to the German imperialists they would send troops to crush the Bolshevik revolution there. It was the bloody *concretization* of what he had mentally decided upon that staggered him. He and the rest of the leaders in power lived through a violent inner storm and were hardened. In the years ahead, the slaughter of millions of workers and peasants in China, Spain and elsewhere was purely routine to Stalin, Trotsky and the others in their political activity to prevent the breakdown of the burocratic power in Russia.

On March 8, 1918, five days after the Brest terms had been signed, Lenin at the Seventh Congress, pressed by the charges of betrayal, had to make a pretense of concern for the fate of the Finnish workers. He, therefore, assured the Congress that he had already fur-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

nished aid to them: "During these five days we have aided our Finnish comrades; how much, I will not say, that they themselves know." And immediately following these words Lenin gave a description of the concrete form his "aid" had taken: "The talk that we have betrayed Finland is the most childish phrasemongering. We have actually helped her by *retreating* from the Germans in time." (XV, R. 145; *S. W.* VII, 310. Our emph.—G. S.)

Thus ran Lenin's new "logic," a product of personal power: at Brest his representatives sat with Hoffmann—and that was how he "helped" the German proletariat; now he retreated rapidly before Hoffmann—and that was how he "helped" the Finnish proletariat!

After the Finnish workers had been crushed, the Bolshevik burocrats and their international supporters appealed to the world proletariat to protest against the fiendish deeds of the German imperialists and their Finnish puppets. But the *political* murderer of the revolutionary vanguard of Finland was well concealed from the eyes of the world proletariat. To the advanced workers everywhere, as well as to his victims in Finland, he was "our great teacher and leader of the world revolution."

2. *Esthonia and Latvia*

At the January 22 (9) meeting of the Central Committee Lenin, unlike in the case of Finland, admitted that by withdrawing the Army he was handing over Esthonia to the German imperialists. However, in the same breath he argued that by signing the treaty with the German imperialists he was somehow saving Esthonia: "By withdrawing the troops we are giving up the Esthonian Socialist Republic to the Germans . . . By signing the peace we, of course, are betraying the self-determination of Poland, but we are retaining the Socialist Esthonian Republic and are affording the possibility of strengthening our conquests." (XV, R. 622)

According to Trotsky's testimony, Lenin was perfectly willing to try having a Hoffmann advance at the cost of two more revolutionary countries, Esthonia and Latvia. If Trotsky is to be believed, Lenin was in good cheer at the thought, even in jocular spirits: " 'With this understanding the experiment is probably not so dangerous. We risk the loss of Esthonia and Latvia. Some Esthonian comrades came to see me recently and told me how splendidly the peasants had begun the Socialist structure. It is a great pity if we must sacrifice Socialist Esthonia,' Lenin said jokingly, 'but for the sake of a good peace it is worth while agreeing to a compromise.' " *(Lenin,* 109, Jan. 1924). In the work from which the above is cited the idea is conveyed that Lenin was willing to abandon the revolutionary workers of the two countries to be butchered by German imperialism for the purpose of establishing a "good peace" with that imperialism. In a later work of Trotsky's the peace version is a little different but the point about Lenin's sportive mood while giving up these two countries is retained:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

" 'We will only risk losing Esthonia and Latvia.' And Lenin added with a slight chuckle: 'For the sake of a good peace with Trotsky, Latvia and Esthonia are worth losing.' For several days, this phrase was his favorite refrain." *(My Life,* II, 111)

The Esthonian and Latvian workers and peasants were not asked, of course, as to whether it was all right with them to be shot, hanged, or thrown into dungeons by the crowned murderer Wilhelm II for the sake of a "good peace" either between Lenin and Trotsky or of these two leaders with the bloody imperialist hangman.

Naturally, the burocratic deeds of Lenin and Trotsky were invariably presented as being "in the interest of the revolution," or "in the name of the revolution." When Hoffmann had crossed the Dvina and the doom of the revolutionary masses of Latvia and Esthonia was obvious, Lenin said: "Here the Germans will seize Latvia and Esthonia, but we can give them up in the name of the revolution." (XV, R., 629)

In connection with the betrayal of the Latvian workers L. Stupochenko describes an episode at the February 24, 1918 meeting of the Bolshevik fraction of the C. E. C. of Soviets:

"Some comrade from the ranks asks for the floor.

" 'What's the matter?' Sverdlov inquires.

" 'Comrades,' the other says, his voice breaking emotionally, 'we, Latvians, could not secure directives from our organization because we are cut off from it by the Front. We don't know the opinion of our comrades. And yet this peace dooms Soviet Latvia to destruction and by signing it we are signing the death warrant of the best sons of the working class, our bosom friends and comrades. We are submitting to your decision, we shall vote together with you, but do understand how agonizingly bitter it is for us to do so.'

"And the horrible tragedy which our comrades are living through becomes obvious to us all. The tactful Sverdlov, with his iron inflexibility, readily responds to this involuntary painful outcry which has fallen from the lips of the emotionally wrought up Latvian Communists. 'Comrades! We cannot demand superhuman efforts. The Latvian comrades, indeed, feel extremely bitter; we shall permit them to refrain from voting.'

"The proposal is adopted unanimously. 'Latvian comrades! The Fraction allows you to refrain from voting, but you will leave the hall before the vote is taken so that the Fraction remains united and solid. No one else dares to leave before the voting since this will be violation of Party discipline.' " ("During the Brest Days," *Prolet. R.* #4, 1923, 109)

In this episode is reflected the burocratic technique the Bolshevik leaders employed in applying their discipline. A group of Latvian Bolsheviks, in despair over the fate of their comrades whom Lenin is about to hand over to the German executioners, in their psychological-emotional enslavement to Lenin are reluctantly submitting to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his will but feel that their voting for the signing of the death warrant of the best workers of Latvia will be long remembered by them and by the proletariat. They are, however, prepared to support the crime with their vote on the strength of "Party" discipline. Sverdlov, with shrewd psychological insight, arbitrarily modifies Party discipline to "clear" their conscience. As one can observe, the high Bolshevik leaders, each an individual dictator, had a variety of approaches to "Party" discipline and the lower level burocrats accepted one-man ruling sometimes cloaked with a "democratic" approval through a vote. There were many others in the Bolshevik fraction of the Central Executive Committee bitterly opposed to Lenin's policy, but they were *Russian,* not Latvian members of the fraction. So in a *national* sense, they could not be considered as betraying their own comrades but only "foreign" comrades. In consequence of the mental quirk induced by Lenin's Brest logic that it was proper and necessary to cast the Finnish, Ukrainian, Latvian and Esthonian "comrades" to the German imperialist executioners for the sake of maintaining the *Russian* "comrades" in power, Sverdlov enjoined the Russian Bolsheviks to cast their vote for Lenin's policy at the general meeting of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets. Stupochenko writes:

"Comrade Sverdlov from a list calls out the members of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee. A never-to-be-forgotten picture. One after the other the Communists get up on the platform and loudly say: 'for.' And those people who regard this decision the doom of the revolution, who only a minute before so desperately fought in the fraction against, now loudly and firmly, looking straight in the eyes of the entire audience, have said 'for' counter to their own sincere conviction, voluntarily submitting to the Party discipline: Steklov, Lunacharsky, Volodarsky.

"I was stunned. Only now I realized what it means to be a member of the Communist Party, what terrible obligations it imposes upon one. I understood that the Communists sometimes are compelled to come out despite themselves to defend and even carry out in life decisions of the majority of the Party with which decisions they don't agree." (110)

The German imperialist terror in Latvia and Esthonia lasted until November 1918 when the Kaiser Government was overthrown and the German Social Democrats—quite naturally no advocates of revolutionary war—capitulated to the Allies. On November 13, 1918 a resolution of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets, over Sverdlov's signature, addressed to the masses of Esthonia, Latvia and other German-occupied territories, told them that they "are now called upon to decide their own fate." In December 1918 the Russian Red Army entered Esthonia. But instead of being allowed to decide their own fate and *elect* officials of their own choice, in line with Lenin's verbal objectives of 1917, the Esthonian workers were forced to accept a ruling body sent from Moscow. That body was especially *appointed*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by Lenin (Decree of Dec. 8, 1918) "as the supreme power of Esthonia." It was headed by "Comrade Anvelt," responsible not to the Esthonian workers whom he had been appointed to rule but to the Sovnarkom in the Kremlin.

3. *The Ukraine*

A major issue in the storm against Lenin's "peace" policy was the Soviet Ukraine. With regard to the Ukraine even Trotsky at the Seventh Congress vented a note of "criticism," with a shade of sarcasm: "the Ukraine is fighting, the Ukrainian proletarians and soldiers are fighting the bourgeoisie. But we, on account of the arisen situation, we do not support them. We are having a breathing spell." (*S. R.* 85). Since Trotsky took the position of acceding to the German demands, his "criticism" was sheer hypocrisy, but the atmosphere was so electric that he had to pretend bitterness and moral opposition to Lenin's policy. Trotsky went as far as actually using the word *betrayal* in one of his phrases: ". . . if we in the name of a breathing spell sign the peace treaty for the sake of which we have betrayed the Ukraine." (84). The word betrayal has an explicit and recognized signification. Betrayal means a *conscious* act of faithlessness, violation of confidence, deliberate desertion of a friend in a moment of need, or abandonment of principles out of some dishonest motive.

Regarding the German demand in the Treaty that the Sovnarkom sign a "peace" with the Ukrainian Rada regime of Vinnichenko, a puppet of the Kaiser, Trotsky declared: "But if the Germans demand that we sign peace with the Ukrainian Rada, then shall we sign it or not? Some comrades of the Central Committee say 'Yes, we will sign'; I say—no. This really would be betrayal in the full sense of the word. It must be pointed out that they are fighting now, fighting with our own proletarian army. I say, therefore: no, comrades, we shall not sign peace with the Ukrainian Rada. There is a certain limit beyond which we cannot go." (85-6)

Trotsky's seemingly determined stand against having any relations with the Ukrainian bourgeoisie was merely a momentary concession to the Ukrainian Bolshevik Secretariat which had declared two weeks earlier "The People's Secretariat views the struggle with the advancing enemy not only as a struggle of the Ukrainian toiling masses against the mutiny of the counter-revolution which has called upon the German troops for help and pursues its goal in this internal class struggle. An understanding with the Ukrainain bourgeoisie would signify a betrayal with respect to the toiling masses of the Ukraine . . ." (From a telegram to the Sovnarkom from Kiev, *Documents on the Hist.* etc., 122-3)

But Lenin ignored the critical sentiment of the Ukrainian Secretariat and manifested determination to go beyond Trotsky's limit. He quite transparently indicated in his concluding remarks to the Congress that he would disregard its decision if it were to approve Trot-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sky's position. "When Comrade Trotsky puts forward a new demand: 'Promise not to conclude peace with Vinnichenko,' I say: under no circumstances will I give such a pledge. If the Congress gave such a pledge, neither I nor a single one of those who think with me would accept any responsibility for it." (XV, R. 144; *S. W.* VII, 308). As to Trotsky's remark about betrayal, Lenin replied in the course of his speech: "Comrade Trotsky says that peace will be a betrayal in the full sense of the word. I insist that this is an entirely false method of arguing when people become victims of phrases." (XV, R. 145; *S. W.* VII, 309)

In this case, however, Trotsky told the truth. He, naturally, violated this truth by subsequently joining Lenin in concluding a treaty with the counter-revolutionary Ukraine (June 12, 1918). The act, to use Trotsky's correct evaluation, was "a betrayal in the full sense of the word."

Antonov-Ovseenko, who in 1917 was a leading Bolshevik in the Baltic Fleet, who "commanded the forces that took the Winter Palace" and who in 1918 "was the People's Commissar of War of the Ukraine" *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* III, 98), throws a very illuminating light on Lenin's policy of abandoning the Ukraine to the rapacious German imperialists. He relates that on March 5, 1918 Lenin informed him that "peace" had been signed. Next came Krylenko's order to stop military action against the Germans. In addition to these messages Antonov had received the Sovnarkom's order on the general demobilization of the Army. This order is printed in the compilation *Documents on the History of Civil War in USSR,* and the most essential part of it is a gem of sophistry: "The halting of demobilization, prompted by the need to counterpose some sort of force to the movement of the enemy, has become in these circumstances a brake on any planned work in organizing resistance. Proceeding from this angle, the People's Commissariat of War decrees: The demobilization, which has been stopped in various regions and localities by individual orders of the commanding personnel, is to be continued in full." (110). The sophistry resides in the Sovnarkom's attempt to obscure the fact that the halting of demobilization by the Petrograd and other districts during the tense hours of waiting for Kuehlmann's reply was in reality a feature of planned resistance. It should be noted that the Sovnarkom at that time refrained from issuing a general order to halt demobilization but limited the tactic to a few localities. The order to resume and complete demobilization was issued by the Sovnarkom on March 2, 1918, nearly two weeks before the ratification of the Brest Treaty by the Fourth Congress of Soviets, even before the Treaty was signed by Karakhan. The number of soldiers still remaining in the Army was enormous judging by Lenin's statement in 1919: "Comrades, regarding military activity, in February and March 1918—a year ago—we had no army of any kind. We had, perhaps ten million armed workers and peasants who comprised the old army which was completely decomposed, per-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

meated with the determination to run away and cast aside everything at all costs." (XVI, R. 66-7)

Realizing that the demobilization of the October Army fighting in the Ukraine would be fatal to the task of resisting the German occupation, Antonov sent a sharp protest to Lenin with the demand that the Army under his charge be excluded from the order. Evidently Antonov did not take Lenin's persistent talk about the supposed worthlessness of the Army seriously. Also, his protest indicates that he did not suspect that the northern "comrades" had sold the Ukraine. Although the Army was rolling back, permeated with the ideology of demobilization so persistently inculcated by the Sovnarkom, Antonov probably was not aware that it was Lenin and Trotsky who deliberately destroyed that great force. Nonetheless he saw clearly that their orders definitely strengthened this ideology: "In the units at our disposal there is observed the predominance of the mood of demobilization. This mood, naturally, is being strengthened by such orders. Our 'northerners' absolutely did not take into account the special situation in the Ukraine and the tasks with which we have been charged. In the order of the People's Commissar of War on general demobilization, which was to us a bolt out of the blue, on the heels of Krylenko's order, there was also nothing specifically stated regarding our forces in the Ukraine. I had to give a sharp reply to these orders: 'Petrograd. To the Soviet of People's Commissars, Lenin, copy to the People's Commissar, Podvoisky. I protest in the most resolute fashion against the announcement of general demobilization. Since you placed the responsibility upon me you should have come in touch with me. I demanded that you declare by telegram that the demobilization order does not concern the troops fighting on the Ukrainian Front. My entire artillery and cavalry are perishing. Your order has said nothing about artillery, cavalry and definite fronts. Kick out the collegium of war commissars who don't understand the military business. Don't let them ruin the situation. The situation could have been saved, but now I don't know what's what—you have deprived me of the Army. Antonov.' " *(Notes on the Civil War,* II, R. 17)

It is obvious that Antonov, moved by a desire to reestablish the Front in the Ukraine, courageously flung the charge of sabotage into the faces of Lenin and Trotsky: "The situation could have been saved . . . You deprived me of the Army." Operating in the tense Ukrainian atmosphere, Antonov, evidently, clung to hope—if only Lenin and Trotsky would exempt the military units in the Ukraine from the general demobilization order.

What was Lenin's reply to the obvious accusation of sabotage and to the daring demand that the Sovnarkom reverse its policy on demobilization with respect to the Ukraine? Antonov records: "As far as I remember I got no answer whatsoever, and no explanation. Under such conditions the hopelessness of the struggle against the regular forces of Austro-German imperialism was quite obvious to us." (17-18).

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Ironically enough, sometime later an intrigue was organized against Antonov and one of the frame-up charges against him was: "unsuccessful struggle against the Germans." (III, 40)

While Lenin signed the death warrant of the tens of thousands of revolutionary Ukrainian workers and peasants, his comrades, Stalin, Zinoviev and other burocrats covered up the crime. Stalin gave honeyed promises to the victims that they would receive all-out help from the Sovnarkom: "The German calculation of killing two rabbits with one swift blow (to get grain and to destroy the Soviet Ukraine) has all the chances of becoming transformed into a prolonged war of foreign enslavers against the twenty million people of the Ukraine whom they want to deprive of bread and freedom. Is it necessary to add that the Ukrainian workers and peasants will not spare any efforts in the heroic struggle against the 'civilized' oppressors? Is it necessary to prove that the *fatherland* war, begun in the Ukraine, can count on all-out support from Soviet Russia?" *(Izvestia,* March 14, 1918; *Documents* etc., 308)

The pattern of Lenin's "theoretical" stratagems to cover up the betrayal of the workers of Finland, of the Ukraine and of other countries is familiar to the student of the cover methods employed by the Stalin, Trotsky and other "revolutionary" burocrats. We have witnessed how in 1933, after betraying the German masses to Hitler, the Stalin burocrats shifted the guilt onto the shoulders of Social Democracy and Trotsky; the Trotskyites, concealing their own share in the crime, put the responsibility chiefly on Social Democracy and Stalin; and how the burocrats of all the camps of "revolutionary" treachery denounced Hitler into whose clutches they had betrayed the masses. In the ensuing Nazi terror the Stalin burocrats went so far as to put the blame for the tragedy they had engineered upon their victims themselves by saying that "The toiling masses must atone heavily for having believed the promises of Hitler." *(Daily Worker,* Jan. 2, 1936). As to the policies of Stalin, Trotsky, Social Democracy and Anarchism in these betrayals, the leadership of each of these tendencies claims to have been "correct." For example, in the Chinese Revolution, (1925-27) Stalin, after duping the Shanghai workers and delivering them to Chiang Kai-shek's hangmen, declared: "The line adopted was the only correct line." *(Pravda,* April 21, 1927)

In May 1918, a few weeks after turning the workers of Finland and the Ukraine over to the Ukrainian and Finnish bourgeoisie and their allies the German imperialists, Lenin wrote: "we witness in the Ukraine and in Finland unparalleled atrocities and seas of blood with which the bourgeoisie and its partisans from the Cadets to the SRs are flooding the cities which they are conquering with the aid of their allies. All this shows what is in store for the proletariat if it does not fulfill its historical task." *(Pravda,* May 24, 1918; XV, R. 295). The Brest policy, the very mechanics of the betrayal, was of course, "correct" according to Lenin: "Our correctness in the matter of concluding

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Brest peace has been borne out by the entire course of events . . ." (370)

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF LENIN'S MYTHICAL PEACE

1. *German Imperialist Intervention*

WHILE LENIN played up the "respite" myth to a high degree, some of the workers who fell victim to the deception that the Brest "peace" would bring an actual breathing spell from war and privation received a rude shock when they learned that despite the signing and ratification of the Treaty the war of German imperialism against the Russian masses continued. On the 13 of March, ten days after Karakhan signed the Brest "peace," Lenin, asserting that Bolshevik Russia had received a breathing spell from the military pressure of German imperialism, at the same time indirectly admitted that his story of respite was a myth: "We have now been granted a breathing spell, but from the west and east there are moving upon us the imperialist plunderers." (XV, R. 168). However, the Bolshevik rulers were forced to take up the matter with the German imperialists. On April 21, 1918 the new Commissar for Foreign Affairs Chicherin sent a note to the German Secretary of Foreign Affairs, declaring: "The invasion of the Crimea is a flagrant violation of the Brest Treaty in that it is tantamount to invasion of the territory of the Soviet Republic. The invasion threatens our Black Sea front and may lead to clashes occassioned by the necessity of defending our fleet. The People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs entertains the hope that further penetration will be stopped." (Omsk *Izvestia,* April 25, 1918; Bunyan, *Intervention Civil War and Communism in Russia,* 56)

The penetration continued. Having occupied the Ukraine the German troops advanced farther south, east and northward into Russian territory. On April 27, 1918 Chicherin dispatched another note admitting that the "peace" the Bolsheviks were so widely publicizing was a fable. "The Russian Soviet Government has taken every measure to observe strictly the terms of the Treaty in order to safeguard for our people its essential purpose—a state of peace. In reality, however, peace does not exist." (Bunyan, 114)

Despite Chicherin's official admission that there was no peace, Lenin, two days after the April 27 Note had been dispatched, printed his pamphlet "The Immediate Tasks of the Soviet Government" the opening words of which read: "thanks to the peace which has been achieved—" *(S. W.* VII, 313; XV, R. 193; *Izvestia,* April 29, 1918). This obvious perversion of fact was not a chance misrepresentation but part of the broad policy of deception Lenin had adopted after dismissing the true Soviet Government (the Second Congress of Soviets). Up to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the October Revolution the Bolshevik struggle for peace, at least in words, was revolutionary; after the October Revolution, both in words and in deeds, counter-revolutionary. But during the Brest period Lenin told the workers this falsehood: "A truly revolutionary struggle for peace was started in Russia only after the victory of the Revolution of 25 of October . . ." ("Theses on Constituent Assembly" *Pravda,* Jan., 8, 1918 (Dec. 26, 1917)). Now, while war continued in Russia he assured the workers that he had achieved peace for them, just as, while he was gathering up the fragments of the old Tsarist burocracy, he told the workers he was building a new, proletarian administration, and just as, while he was setting up a system of individual dictator-burocrats, he asserted he was establishing proletarian democracy.

The Chicherin Note of April 27, 1918 was vastly different from the usual diplomatic protests against warlike acts of a "friendly" power. The Note was couched in terms of servile attention. Harsh and oppressive as the terms of the Treaty were, Lenin was willing to strip the country to the bone rather than declare a revolutionary war. Accordingly, the Chicherin Note did not call upon the Kaiser Government to adhere to the Treaty, but broadly hinted a disposition to entertain additional extortionist demands: "If the German Government thinks that it can no longer observe the terms of the Peace Treaty which was ratified by both States, it becomes absolutely necessary that the German Government state clearly the new demands for the sake of which it directs the Ukrainian, Finnish and German forces against the Russian Soviet Republic."

Due to Lenin's Brest "peace" policy, the Ukraine and Finland instead of becoming revolutionary segments of an expanding World Proletarian State, were now White Guard enemies of the Russian Bolshevik State; instead of, at least, leaving the Russian masses alone, the White Guard regimes of these countries, supported by German bayonets, opened a violent military attack. On May 14, 1918 Lenin admitted that peace did not exist between Soviet Russia and the governments which had succeeded the Bolshevik regimes in Finland and the Ukraine: "It followed naturally from the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk that we should conclude complete peace with Finland, the Ukraine, and Turkey; yet we *continue in a state of war* with each of these countries, and this, not as a consequence of the internal development of those countries, but of the influence of the ruling classes of another country." (XV, R 287; *C. W.* XXIII, 22). And in the very next paragarph, using his new method of "logic," Lenin completely contradicted himself: "The respite, secured through the conclusion of the Brest peace, of which there were uttered so many empty and unnecessary words supposedly proving the impossibility of its achievement, proved possible after all—we have been enjoying it in the last two months."

April was one of the two months of "respite" according to Lenin. In that very month the German troops swept northward through the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Ukraine into numerous Russian towns, entering such large centers as Voronezh, Kursk and Orel. The April "respite" was further marked by the German occupation of the Crimea. Sevastopol was entered on April 30, 1918, one day after Lenin published his lying words "Thanks to the peace achieved—"

Lenin concluded his "respite" speech by reading a telegram from Joffe, "the ambassador of the Soviet Republic in Berlin." In passing, it may be pointed out that the idea of ambassadors of a Proletarian State to bourgeois powers had been just as alien to the Bolshevik writings of the pre-October period as negotiations and treaties with those powers. In the telegram Joffe asserted that he had secured a positive promise from the Kaiser government: "The reply I received was that the German High Command declares that there will be no further advance."

Even while Lenin was reading these false assurances, the German imperialists were carrying on their machinations with the counter-revolutionary Russian generals in the Don Soviet Region, and soon penetrated into the Don and Kuban territories and the Northern Caucasus. Germany's ally, Turkey, meanwhile invaded the Caucasus from the south. "The Germans were advancing. We had no breathing spell." Antonov-Ovseenko later wrote. *(Notes on the Civil War,* II, 46)

As we have shown, on various occasions during the Stalin epoch, Mensheviks, bourgeois correspondents and intellectuals like Eastman printed some facts about the secret affairs of the Bolshevik burocracy and conditions in Russia, while Trotsky, Stalin and other Bolshevik burocrats denied the truth. So in the Lenin period it was the pink Liberals like Maxim Gorky in the *Novaia Zhisn* who pointed out the burocratic lies. In the case of the fictitious breathing spell, everybody saw it was a lie except the hypnotized hero-worshipping Bolshevik workers. A Right SR, Kogan-Bernstein, a Kerenskyite, replied to Lenin: "It is ridiculous to talk about a breathing-spell when the German armies are advancing on every front." *(Sten. Rep. of the Sessions of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Fourth Convocation,* R. 277; Bunyan 122)

2. *The Strange Case of the Black Sea Fleet*

Lenin's general attitude toward the steady encroachments of German imperialism was one of appeasement and repeated concessions. On April 27, 1918, three days before the Germans entered the Black Sea fortress and naval base of Sevastopol, all first-line battleships left for Novorossisk. The Kaiser Government, disappointed that a rich prize had escaped, demanded of the Sovnarkom that the Fleet be returned to the German-occupied fortress. "And in this critical moment the demand was made of us to order the return of the Black Sea Fleet from Novorossisk to Sevastopol. As a result of further negotiations, we received the guarantee from Germany that the ships would

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

not be used during the war, and after the conclusion of a general peace they would be returned to Russia." (Chicherin, Report to the Fifth Soviet Congress, July 1918. Supplement to Fraina's *Prol. Rev. in Russia,* 416). "Our consent was obtained for the return of our Fleet."

Accordingly, in line with his policy of fulfilling virtually every extortionist demand of German imperialism, Lenin at once ordered the Fleet back to Sevastopol to surrender to the Kaiser. (June 9, 1918) But in the case of the Black Sea Fleet, in contrast to the case of Finland, both the Kaiser and Lenin made a slight miscalculation. To the Russian sailors the idea of handing over their ships to the invader was repugnant. Many of them refused to carry out the Sovnarkom's order and, defying both the Bolshevik burocrats in Moscow and the bourgeois statesmen in Berlin, they sank a good part of the Fleet. The less courageous sailors dutifully obeyed the Sovnarkom and brought their ships to Sevastopol. "The return of a part of the fleet to Sevastopol on June 18 and the sinking of the rest on June 19 made an end of this critical event." *(Ib.)*

Vague reports of the Black Sea Fleet affair reached the ears of the workers in Moscow; on June 28, 1918 while Lenin was speaking at a session of the Fourth Conference of Trade Unions and Factory Committees of Moscow, someone interrupted him with a cry: "Tell us about the Black Sea Fleet!"

In replying Lenin avoided giving any real information on the scandalous policy of the Sovnarkom: "I will reply to the question about the Black Sea Fleet, which has been put seemingly for the purpose of exposing us. Let me tell you that the man operating there was Comarde Sokolnikov whom the Moscow and Petrograd workers know very well by his agitation and Party work. Comrade Sokolnikov himself will be here and will tell you how he agitated in favor of destroying the Fleet rather than allow the German troops to use it for an attack on Novorossisk. That was the situation with regard to the Black Sea Fleet, and the People's Commissars Stalin, Shliapnikov and Raskolnikov will arrive in Moscow soon and will tell us all about it. You will see that ours was the only policy which, like the policy of Brest peace, has brought us numerous oppressive misfortunes, but which enabled the Soviet Government and the workers-Socialist revolution to hold their banner aloft before the workers of all countries." (XV, R. 354; *S. W.* VII, 419)

Lenin kept silent about the German demand for the Fleet and about his own order to take the Fleet back to Sevastopol. And while referring to Sokolnikov's agitation, Lenin did not disclose that a portion of the Fleet had been actually handed over to the Kaiser. The mysterious contradiction that a part of the Fleet was sunk and the other part delivered to the Germans, demonstrating two opposite policies, was never explained by Lenin.

We have cited from an authentic record Chicherin's admission of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lenin's consent to deliver the Fleet to the Kaiser. We shall further cite the peremptory order of the Sovnarkom to the command of the Fleet in Novorossisk: "We are making clear and confirm for the last time the issued order to move the Fleet from Novorossisk to Sevastopol where it must remain to the end of the war as an inviolable property of the Russian republic. Only madmen or criminals can counter-act this direct order of the Soviet power which was chosen by many millions of workers and peasants. The 15 of June is the final date. We order the Commander of the Naval forces, the Chief Commissar and the Delegates' Congress to take measures relative to the immediate execution of the order. June 13, 1918, No. 48, Chairman of the Central Executive Committee, Sverdlov, Chairman of the Sovnarkom, Lenin, People's Commissar, Trotsky." *(Arkhiv Russkoi Revolutsii,* XIV, 216-17)

To cover up this policy, the Stalin historians reverse the facts and state that the Sovnarkom's line was to sink the Fleet. As to the fact that part of the Fleet was handed over by Lenin to German imperialism, that is laid to—agents of *counter-revolution!* "After the arrival of the Black Sea Fleet in Novorossisk the German Command presented an ultimatum on the return of the Fleet to Sevastopol, intending to seize it. The Soviet Government took a decision to sink the fleet at Novorossisk at once. On the 18 and 19 of June in the outer Novorossisk bay were sunk one battleship and nine destroyers. A number of the sailors yielded to the persuasions of agents of counter-revolution and on the 17 of June took to Sevastopol the battleship *Volia,* one cruiser and seven destroyers." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LXI, 348)

Like all the other "blessings" of Lenin's "breathing spell," his compliance with the German demand regarding the Black Sea Fleet resulted in the further weakening of the Russian workers and the strengthening of their class enemies. Whereas previously the Black Sea Fleet had played an important part in aiding the workers in the territory of the Sea of Azov to gain the coal-mining districts of the Don Basin and in protecting the northern coastal regions of the Caucusus, now with the delivery of some warships to the Kaiser and the destruction of the rest, the White Guard generals could operate with greater advantage. Stripped of naval protection Novorossisk fell to Denikin in August 1918.

The elimination of the Black Sea Fleet proved of immense value to the Allied imperialists who, after the collapse of the German Empire and its Turkish and other Allies, entered the Black Sea (November 1918), seized the Russian ships and sent them to rust in French African ports. For nearly three years the Allies were able without any naval hindrance from the Bolshevik State to send numerous transports with war supplies to the White Armies of Denikin and Wrangel.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3. *The Attempted Horse-Deal with Allied and German Imperialists*

The intervention of the Allied imperialists into the Russian situation is pictured by the Stalin historians as follows: "The imperialists of Great Britain, France, Japan and America started their military intervention without any declaration of war, although the intervention was a war, a war against Russia, and the worst kind of war at that. These 'civilized' marauders secretly and stealthily made their way to Russian shores and landed their troops on Russia's territory." *(History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* 227). This story sounds convincing, but how does it jibe with the real facts of history? How "secretly and stealthily" did the Allied imperialists land? What was Lenin's policy immediately before and during the arrival of Allied troops?

Prior to the October Revolution the Bolshevik position toward the Allies was declared to be: "No peace with the German capitalists, and complete break with the Anglo-French capitalists! Let the English get out of Turkey, and let them not fight for Bagdad! Let them get out of India and Egypt! We do not want to fight to save the accumulated loot, just as we refuse to spend one atom of our energy to help the German brigands save their loot." (Lenin, Speech on War, *Pravda,* July 13, 14, 15, 1917; *C. W.* XX B. II, 216). As we have seen, following the dismissal of the true Soviet Government the Bolshevik leaders announced that they were not breaking "with our allies." When the Allies applied pressure to get Bolshevik Russia to participate in the War on their side the Sovnarkom outlined its policy in these words: "The Russian people are interested in having economic and political relations with the Allies, but they are not willing to pay for them with blood to the satisfaction of Clemenceau and the New York kings of war industry." *(Izvestia,* Nov. 27, (14) 1917). During Hoffmann's extended penetration of Russian territory and after the conclusion of the Brest "peace," Lenin and Trotsky gave the Allied representatives the impression that Bolshevik Russia would join in the fight against Germany. This was a period of a "friendly" attitude on the part of the Allied governments. Chicherin reported to the Fifth Congress of Soviets in July 1918: "But the governments of the Entente Powers adhered to a very careful policy regarding Russia, especially did the government of the United States of America adopt a decidedly friendly attitude." (Cited by Fraina, 410). Apparently, the Allies wished to re-establish the Eastern Front, feeling that unless a part of the German war machine were diverted from France, the fight would be hopeless. Addressing a Note to the Imperial War Council, Winston Churchill stated: "If we cannot reconstitute the fighting front against Germany in the East, no end can be discerned of the war. Vain will be all the sacrifices of the peoples and the armies . . ." *(The World Crisis,* 1916-1918)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

At the Seventh Congress, just four days after the Brest "peace" had been signed, Trotsky told the delegates that Lenin and he were going to substitute a modern military struggle against the German invader for the primitive rage of the Pskov peasants. He gave an inkling that he would secure the cooperation of the Allied imperialists: "To conduct a war we must have not only the knives in the hands of the Pskov peasants but cannon, shells, rifles, etc. If America, which today because of those or other considerations finds it profitable to sell rifles and cannon, we shall take them for our purposes, not frightened by the fact that they came from the imperialists. That's how Lenin and I looked upon this issue and calculated that America will give us war equipment out of its own considerations." *(Sten. Rep.* 83). Indeed, after the signing of the Brest "peace" fairly close diplomatic and military relations were established between the Sovnarkom and the Allies. Radek in *Pravda* of March 14, 1923 revealed that Allied officers participated with the Bolshevik leaders in making plans for organizing the Red Army: "In April 1918 in Comrade Podvoisky's cabinet gathered the best of the former Tzarist officers, those who remained in the Army after our victory, in order, together with our comrades and with some *military representatives of the Allies,* to work out a plan for organizing an army." *(Portreti i Pamphleti,* 30. Our emph.—G. S.). Jacque Sadoul, a member of the French Mission in Russia, who broke with it in September 1918 and joined Lenin, later participating in the founding of the Comintern, wrote on March 26, 1918: "The French Mission must, naturally, play the principal role in that reorganization. Several officers will be attached directly to Trotsky, forming a kind of military cabinet and supervising the different activities of the Commissariat of War." (Cited by Bunyan 62-3, from J. Sadoul, *Notes sur la revolution bolshevique,* Octobre 1917—Janvier 1919, 272). Trotsky records that Lenin and he carried on negotiations "with Generals Lavergne and Niessel and Captain Jacques Sadoul representing the French, and with Colonel Raymond Robbins representing the Americans." *(Stalin,* 252). On March 19, 1918 Robbins reported to U. S. Ambassador Francis: "Conference with Trotsky yesterday most satisfactory. He asks for five American officers to act as inspectors of the organization . . . of the Soviet Army . . ." *(Russian-American Relations,* March 1917-March 1920. *Documents and Papers,* 104. Cited by James Bunyan, *Intervention,* 62)

Neither Trotsky, nor Lenin, nor Chicherin nor any other top Bolshevik burocrat ever revealed to the proletariat the content of the unofficial exchanges between them and the Allied representatives. Lenin in his "Letter to the American Workers" in August 1918 did not go beyond stating that: "When the rapacious beasts of German imperialism in February 1918 led their troops against defenseless, demobilized Russia which relied on the international solidarity of the proletariat before the international revolution completely ripened, I did not hesitate in the least to enter into a certain 'agreement' with

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

French Monarchists." (XV, R. 407). "We were shaking hands with a French Monarchist, realizing that either of us would willingly hang his 'partner,' but our interests for a time coincided. Against the attacking German robbers *we* utilized the equally predatory interests of other imperialists thereby serving the interests of Russian and international revolution." (408)

A definite though meagre light on the Lenin-Allied agreement was thrown by United States Senator Johnson of California. Arguing against American intervention in Russia, Johnson read from a document of inquiry submitted by the Lenin-Trotsky regime early in March 1918 to the then "friendly" Wilson Administration: "In case (a) the All-Russian congress of Soviets will refuse to ratify the peace treaty with Germany, or (b) if the German Government, breaking the peace treaty, will renew the offensive in order to continue its robber raid, or (c) if the Soviet government will be forced by the actions of Germany to renounce the peace treaty—before or after its ratification —and to renew hostilities—

"In all these cases it is very important for the military and political plans of the Soviet power for replies to be given to the following questions:

"1. Can the Soviet government rely on the support of the United States of North America, Great Britain, and France in its struggle against Germany? . . .

"3. . . . In the opinion of the Government of the United States, to what extent—under the above-mentioned circumstances—would aid be assured from Great Britain through Murmansk and Archangel? What steps could the Government of Great Britain undertake in order to assure this aid and thereby to undermine the foundations of the rumors of the hostile plans against Russia on the part of Great Britain in the nearest future." *(Congressional Record,—Senate,* Jan. 29, 1919, 2263)

In this document Murmansk and Archangel are clearly designated. It begins to appear that the Stalinist story about the Allied imperialists "secretly and stealthily" approaching the Russian shores and landing troops is not exact.

United States Ambassador, David Francis, in his book *Russia From the American Embassy* testifies that Trotsky *welcomed* the landing on the assumption that the British would protect the Murmansk railway against the German-Finnish threat. (864-5)

Evidently when Lenin indicated in his Letter to the American Workers that he had attempted a policy of cooperation with the Allied imperialists he reported a fact. It is possible that Trotsky more openly than Lenin expressed the willingness to collaborate with the Allied imperialists after Hoffmann had advanced too deep into Russia. On April 25, 1918 Balfour in a Note to the United States said that "Trotsky, at least, has for some time shown signs of recognizing that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cooperation with the Allies is the only hope of freeing Russia from the Germans." *(U. S. Foreign Relations, 1918, Russia,* II, 135-7)

On May 8, 1918 the German imperialists presented to Lenin-Trotsky a Note demanding the surrender of Fort Ino to Finland in order to weaken the Petrograd defenses. (Chicherin, *Izvestia,* Nov. 6, 1919). This new German pressure could only serve to strengthen the idea of the Kremlin burocrats to arrange an inter-imperialist clash on their territory. According to Louis Fischer, as allegedly reported to him by Chicherin, the Sovnarkom proposed a deal to the Allied imperialists: "In June—it was before the Mirbach assassination—Chicherin tells the writer, he sent one of his subordinates, a Left Social Revolutionary named Vosnisensky, to Vologda to interview the Allied mission there. Vosnisensky saw Noulens, who spoke frankly of his proposed 'Little' intervention for anti-German purposes and of 'Big' intervention for anti-Bolshevik purposes. He likewise saw Sir F. L. Lindley, the British envoy. He informed both Noulens and Lindley, under instructions from Moscow, that the Soviets would not resist landings of foreign troops on the Arctic provided they moved inland in the direction of Finland against the German forces there. But if they proceeded towards Petrograd or Moscow, the Bolsheviks would be forced to fight." *(S. in W. A.* 126)

While the Lenin-Trotsky flirtations with the Allied imperialists continued, evidence was forthcoming that the latter's goal was the overthrow of the Bolshevik regime. Lenin began to reverse his policy and ordered the Murmansk Soviet to oust the Allied forces. At its June 30, 1918 session the Murmansk Soviet split on the issue, the majority favoring a continuation of the previous course. (M. Levidow, *K Istorii Soiuznoi Interventsii v Rossii,* 98-115). On July 1, 1918 Chicherin over direct wire from Moscow argued the issue with Yurev, Chairman of the Murmansk Soviet. Yurev categorically refused to carry out the Sovnarkom's orders: "We ourselves know that the Germans and the Allies are imperialists, but of two evils we have chosen the lesser." (M. Kedrin, *Bez Bolshevistskogo Rukovodstva,* 130, 132. Cited by James Bunyan in *Intervention,* 134). On the same day, July 1, 1918 Trotsky issued an Order in which, keeping quiet about his secret contacts and previous collaboration with the Allies and about his acquiescence in the landing of the British at Murmansk, he declared: "Notwithstanding the protest of the Commissar of Foreign Affairs, a foreign landing has been made at Murmansk. I have been ordered by the Soviet of People's Commissars to take the necessary measures to protect the White Sea coast from the foreign imperialists." On July 29, 1918 Lenin in a speech before the Central Executive Committee announced "We have now a state of war with Anglo-French imperialism." (XV, R. 401). This statement, however, was for circulation among the Russian masses; privately Chicherin reassured the Allied diplomats that Lenin had no warlike intentions at all and asked them to remain in Russia. *(U. S. Foreign Relations, 1918,* Russia I, 648-9)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

On August 1, 1918 the Sovnarkom issued an appeal to the masses of France, England, America, Italy and Japan. The German masses were omitted, indicating a gesture toward the Kaiser Government. Far from representing a turn toward revolutionary war against the world bourgeoisie, the appeal was merely a call to the masses of Allied countries to express sympathy for Bolshevik Russia and to condemn interference in its supposedly purely Russian affairs. The document put the blame for Lenin's Brest policy not on its author but—on the *Allied imperialists!* "We were forced to sign the Brest Peace, which dismembered Russia, only because your governments, fully aware of the fact that Russia was not in a condition to fight any longer, would not agree to international peace negotiations, in which their strength would have saved Russia and given you an honorable peace. It is not Russia, which for three and a half years has been bleeding to death, that has sold your cause; it is your own governments, which have thrown Russia under the heel of German imperialism." (Kluchnikov and Sabanin, *International Politics of Most Recent Period*, II, R. 160; Fraina, 428; Bunyan, 141). The consciousness of the duplicity of this political concoction, signed by Chicherin, Trotsky and Lenin, is obvious. Who precisely was the originator of this piece of demagogy is difficult to determine. It may have been Trotsky. It is reproduced by Lenin in almost identical words in his Letter to the American Workers three weeks later. (XV, 405-6)

When Lenin issued the August 1 appeal to the masses of Allied countries he knew well that the Allied governments, just as the governments of the Central Powers, would not have given an honorable peace to anybody. He had stated this truth on numerous occasions before taking power. Yet now he was trying to convince the workers that such a peace could have been achieved had the Allies entered into negotiations with the Kaiser and the Sovnarkom! Having reneged on all his 1917 revolutionary pledges and adopted a deliberate course for a German "peace," Lenin in succession pinned the blame for this policy on the October Army, on the peasants, on the Bukharinites, on the SRs and the Mensheviks, and now, with rare cynicism blamed it upon the Allied imperialists!

The Allied intervention seriously alarmed Lenin and Trotsky because it constituted a real danger to their power. The German imperialists "limited" themselves to a virtually unlimited robbing of the Russian masses but left the Lenin-Trotsky regime alone (Lenin, speech for acceptance of Brest terms, Ovsiannikov, 632). The Allied imperialists, on the other hand, unfolded a policy to destroy this regime. Willy-nilly Lenin and Trotsky were compelled to struggle for the preservation of their power. It was logical for these unprincipled usurpers at this juncture to orient again toward the German imperialists. On August 20, 1918, Lenin in his "Letter to the American Workers" stated a policy which he had undoubtedly adopted before he wrote the document: "And no matter how much the beasts of

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Anglo-French imperialism will howl, no matter how much they will slander us and how many millions they will spend to bribe the Right SR, Menshevik and other social-patriotic papers, *I will not hesitate for a second* to conclude a similar 'agreement' with the robbers of German imperialism if forced by the advance of Anglo-French troops against Russia." (408)

4. *The Revolt of the Czechoslovaks*

Under Kerensky about fifty thousand Czechoslovak soldiers, prisoners of war from the Austrian Army, were formed into a Czechoslovak Legion and put on the Front to fight "for the liberation of Czechoslovakia." In December 1917 after Lenin and Trotsky took power and, by concluding an armistice with the Kaiser, indicated that they would sign a separate "peace," the Czech National Council in Paris placed the Legion at the disposal of the French military authorities who undertook to arrange for its transportation from the Ukraine to the Western Front. Lenin and Trotsky, solicitous of material and advisory assistance from the Allies, sought to prove by deeds that the "Soviet regime" had no intention of blocking Allied military efforts against German imperialism. Accordingly, Lenin and Trotsky consented that the Czechoslovak Army "by agreement of the Sovnarkom with the Czech command was subject to evacuation via Siberia to the Western Front in France, maintaining its organization and retaining its weapons." (XV, R. Notes, 667)

The Czechoslovak Legion was an efficient fighting force. Since the Legion stood outside the jurisdiction of Lenin and Trotsky they had been unable to demoralize and reduce it to impotence as they had most of the regiments of the October Army. The Legion had proved its effectiveness early in March 1918 when German forces attempted to trap it during its withdrawal from the Ukraine. In a three-day battle at Bakhmach the Czechoslovaks defeated a superior German Army and broke through into Bolshevik territory. "They fought magnificently." (Antonov-Ovseenko, II, 47)

Apparently at first the Legion's Command avoided interference in "Russian" affairs. Had the Legion attempted to overthrow the Bolshevik regime in March it might have succeeded. According to the Report by Captain Hurban of the Legion to Masaryk, President of the Czechoslovak National Council, this could have been achieved by a single Czechoslovak regiment: "We made it clear to the Bolsheviks that if we were not absolutely loyal it would suffice to order one of our regiments (our army was then, in March, near Moscow) to take Moscow, and in half a day there would be no Bolshevik government; for then we were all armed, having taken from the front everything we could carry, so as to prevent it from falling into hands of the Germans (each of our regiments had 200 to 300 machine guns) and nobody in Russia, to say nothing of Moscow, could have at all con-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

templated an attempt at opposition." (Bunyan, 79). Trotsky testifies that "The Czechoslovak Army stood on our soil as an independent power. We could offer almost no opposition to them." *(Lenin,* 152)

As material evidence of their peaceful attitude the Czechoslovaks returned to Lenin and Trotsky a large portion of the military property which Krylenko had abandoned to the Germans and which the Czechs had recaptured during their withdrawal from the Austro-Russian Front: "To prove indisputably our loyalty we turned over everything, all our arms, with the exception of a few rifles which we kept for our, so to say, personal safety (10 rifles for each 100 men) to the Bolsheviks. The equipment we turned over to the Bolsheviks, including arms, horses, automobiles, aeroplanes, etc. was worth more than 1,000,000,000 rubles, and it was logically our possession, for we took it away from the Germans, to whom it was abandoned by the fleeing Bolsheviks. This transfer of the equipment was, of course, preceded by an agreement made between us and the Moscow government, by which we were guaranteed unmolested passage through Siberia." (Cited by Bunyan, 79)

To cooperate with the bourgeoisie in sending the Czechoslovak soldiers, who were workers and peasants in uniform, to slaughter for the imperialist cause, was, from a proletarian revolutionary point of view, a heinous crime. But it was only a minor crime, comparatively speaking, part of the large one called Brest which enmeshed Lenin and Trotsky in many insoluble contradictions.

Vacillating between the desire to please the Allies and to reassure the Germans, and with a growing conviction that the Czechoslovak Legion would be utilized by the Allied Command against the Bolshevik regime, the Sovnarkom began to issue conflicting instructions. When on March 22, 1918, the Omsk Soviet telegraphed the Kremlin expressing fear that the Legion would be used against the Sovnarkom, "Comrade Stalin . . . replied that no armed forces except Soviet troops could be tolerated in the territories of the Soviet Republic and ordered the Czechoslovaks to disarm." (V. Maksakov and A. Turnov, *Khronika Grazhdanskoi Voiny v Sibiri* 1917-1918; Cited by Bunyan, 81). Five days later the Sovnarkom reversed itself on further disarming the Czechs, and Stalin informed the Czechoslovak National Council that the Legion might proceed on condition "that the counter-revolutionary commanders be immediately removed." He also agreed to the retention of "a certain quantity of arms for self-defense against the attacks of counter-revolution." (Jaroslav Kratochvil, *Cesta Revoluci* 42; cited by Bunyan, 81). This confusion continued, with the jittery Sovnarkom changing its line almost every week. Trotsky, now Commissar of War, devised a scheme to incorporate the Czechoslovaks into the Red Army. His aide, Aralov, instructed all Siberian Soviets: "By order of the Chairman of the Commissariat of War, Comrade Trotsky, you are to detain the Czechoslovaks and organize them into labor artels or draft them into the Soviet Red Army." *(Jaroslav Papousek, Chekhoslovaki i*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

Sovety, 52; Cited by Bunyan, 88). Eleven days later Trotsky in soft words "explained" his order: "Through Comrade Aralov I made the Czechoslovaks the following proposal: In case the continuation of their journey should be rendered impossible by failure of the English and French to provide the necessary ships, they (the Czechoslovaks) would be given an opportunity to remain in Russia and choose an occupation most suited to their training and desires, i.e., to enter the Red Army or take up a trade." (I, R. 213. Cited by Bunyan, 88)

The Czechoslovaks began to believe that Lenin and Trotsky were carrying out the German demand to prevent the Legion's evacuation to the Western Front. Lenin and Trotsky meanwhile saw by definite signs, such as the landing of the Japanese at Vladivostok on April 5, that the Allies had decided on intervention. The attempts to disarm the Czechoslovaks led to clashes with the Sovnarkom troops in the middle of May 1918, and in a few days the whole Legion was in open warfare against the Moscow Government. The immediate financing of the uprising was done by the French consul in Moscow. (M. P. Price, *My Reminiscences of the Russian Revolution,* 292)

On June 4, 1918 the Allies formally protested against the attempts to disarm the Czechoslovaks. "While the Czechoslovaks started their rebellion, the representative of France in Moscow declared that the disarmament of the Czechoslovak soldiers would be considered as an unfriendly act of the Soviet government toward France, in which opinion he was supported by the representatives of England, Italy and the United States of North America." (Chicherin at the Fifth Congress of Soviets; Fraina, 421). On July 2, 1918 the Allied Supreme War Council passed an "official" decision for an armed intervention in Russia. One point of the adopted Resolution on the question stated: "To bring assistance to the Czechoslovak forces which have made great sacrifices to the causes for which we are fighting." *(U. S. Foreign Relations, 1918, Russia,* II, 246)

Instead of going to the carnage in France, as Lenin and Trotsky had hoped, the Czechoslovak Legion created a carnage in Russia. United now with the Right SRs and other anti-Bolshevik tendencies the Czechoslovaks seized virtually all of Siberia, the Ural region and the Volga region including the important cities Samara and Kazan and instituted a massacre of the Bolshevik workers in all these territories. Economically, besides causing great damage to industry and agriculture, the Czechoslovaks dealt a severe blow to the Bolshevik State by seizing a large part of the Russian gold reserve and platinum in Kazan.

The Czechoslovak war raged from May to November 1918. After many bloody battles the Legion was driven east. The collapse of the Central Empires and the termination of the War in the West made further fighting meaningless to the Czech soldiers in Siberia and the remnants of the Legion were evacuated.

But the removal of the Czechoslovaks was not followed by Bol-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

shevik occupation of Siberia, for while the Czechs had been holding off the Sovnarkom forces the Allied imperialists and the White Guards under Kolchak had been building a huge military machine there. Kolchak opened a new period of carnage on the heels of the Czechoslovak war. On January 2, 1919 he defeated the Sovnarkom forces in the Urals and pushed westward, with Moscow as his ultimate objective.

Thus, the Czechoslovak affair, a by-product of Lenin's Brest capitulation to the Kaiser, did for the Russian White Guards in Siberia what the German occupation of the Ukraine had performed a short while before for the White Guards on the Don, Kuban and Northern Caucasus.

5. *The Revolt of the Left SRs*

There can be no doubt that had the Bolshevik leadership remained true to its 1917 promises the Left SRs would have enthusiastically fought in a revolutionary war against German imperialism and would have loyally upheld a revolutionary-proletarian-democratic regime. Because of the burocratic behavior of the Bolshevik leadership, the Left SRs were unable to get along with Lenin. Their relationship with the Bolsheviks was falsely presented by him in rosy colors: "The alliance we concluded with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries is built on a firm basis and is growing stronger and stronger every day. At first we on the Council of People's Commissars feared that factional struggles would hinder the work; but now, after the experience of two months of joint work, I must say definitely that on the majority of questions we arrived at unanimous decisions." (Report at the Third All-Russian Congress of Soviets, January 24, 1918. *S. W.* VII, 268). Far from resting on a firm basis, the alliance was growing not stronger but *weaker* every day, and through no fault of the Left SRs, either. For the workers it is *necessary* to have the Left elements of the petty bourgeoisie support the proletariat rather than have them lined up with the enemy. Lenin's Brest policy was pushing these historical supporters of proletarian revolution into the camp of the bourgeoisie. On December 7, 1918, Lenin said: "We know that many parties at that time, due to the Brest peace, turned away from us and went over to the side of the bourgeoisie." (XV, R. 583)

The Left SRs fulminated and thundered against the Brest capitulation, censured Lenin for dereliction of revolutionary duty and carried on an anti-Brest campaign right in the streets, registering passing workers for the Front to fight German imperialism. When the Bolshevik majority of the Fourth Congress of the Soviets ratified the Treaty (March 14-18), the Left SR members of the Sovnarkom resigned in a body, denouncing Lenin's policy and vowing vengeance on the German imperialist looters. The succeeding terrible months of the "breathing spell" only confirmed the predictions and fears that Russia was in peril of dismemberment because of the Brest capitulation. The complete break with Lenin came at the Fifth Congress of Soviets (July

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
_ACCEPT-

4-10, 1918). Maria Spiridonova, a Left Social Revolutionary who was famous in her day for shooting the notorious Governor of Tambov because of his savage treatment of the peasants and who was now called by Lenin "the most sincere representative" of her Party, in a two-hour speech delivered a fiery attack on the Lenin-Trotsky regime. The next day, July 6, 1918 the Left SRs assassinated the German Ambassador in Moscow, Count von Mirbach. The very method proved that the Left SRs essentially were petty-bourgeois terrorists, not proletarian revolutionists. The assassination was the signal for an uprising. The Left SRs declared themselves the ruling Party. The Left SR Commander of the Bolshevik forces fighting the Czechoslovaks on the Volga, Muraviev, gave orders to march on Moscow and proclaimed war against Germany and thus opened the front for the Czechoslovak Legion. However, the soldiers under his command disobeyed his orders, and the whole revolt was quelled within a few days, with the Left SRs splitting, one part going back to the support of the Lenin-Trotsky regime, the other opening an underground struggle against the Bolsheviks primarily through terrorist methods. On August 30, 1918 the Left SRs assassinated Uritsky and wounded Lenin. "An attempt was being prepared also on Comrade Trotsky." (Chicherin, *Izvestia,* Nov. 7, 1919)

6. *When Lenin Would Fight*

The assassination of Count von Mirbach precipitated a crisis for the Lenin-Trotsky regime in its relations with Imperial Germany. In his anxiety to placate the infuriated German rulers, Lenin went to great lengths. Trotsky relates that the Bolshevik leaders weighed two alternatives: to confine themselves to the expression of official diplomatic regrets over the incident or stoop to the level of offering condolences. Lenin chose the latter. Even at that, he could have confined the expression of condolences to an official communication, or he could have sent a representative, himself remaining in the background as the "leader of the world revolution." According to Trotsky's account written in 1924 the chairman of the Sovnarkom decided to go in person: "The drive to the Hohenzollern Embassy, to offer condolences over the death of Count von Mirbach, was not an easy thing for Ilyitch. As an inward experience it was probably one of the most difficult moments of his life." *(Lenin,* 157)

Thus, while the Kaiser's men, thanks to Lenin's Brest policy, were butchering thousands of revolutionary workers and peasants in Finland, the Ukraine, Esthonia, Latvia, Belorussia and the Crimea, "Comrade" Lenin went to express condolences over the death of one of the Kaiser's men.

The German imperialists, although furious over the assassination, were actually too weak to venture an attempt at smashing the Bolshevik regime. They merely presented a request to Lenin that a battalion

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of their troops be allowed to guard the German Embassy in Moscow. Lenin's reaction to this minor demand exposes his policy of yielding to German Imperialism on such vital issues as the Ukraine, Finland, Latvia, Esthonia and the Black Sea Fleet. The obsequiousness suddenly vanished. Lenin flung defiance in the face of German imperialism. The demand had been presented to him on July 14, 1918 at eleven in the evening. Without a single day's delay Lenin handed a statement to the German imperialists in which he declared "While the Government of the Soviet Republic has carried out in the strictest fashion the Brest terms and guarded the will of the workers and peasants to maintain peace, it has never lost sight of the fact that there are certain limits beyond which even the most peaceloving toiling masses will be compelled to rise and will rise as one man to an armed defense of their country!" (Cited by Lenin at the July 15, 1918 Session of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets, XV, R. 386). Lenin explained his reason for threatening the German imperialists with armed resistance: "But when we were informed of the request of the German Government, which has not yet been presented in the form of an absolute demand, that we allow a battalion of armed and uniformed German troops into *Moscow,* we replied, and we repeat that reply now before the highest organ of the workers' and peasants' Soviet state, and All-Russian Central Executive Committee, that under no conditions or circumstances can we accede to such a request; for, objectively speaking, it would mean the beginning of the occupation of *Russia by foreign troops." (C. W.* XXIII, 155; *C. W.* XV, R. 387. Our emph.—G. S.)

Here, finally, we have one of the major keys to Lenin's Brest policy. Apparently, in Lenin's eyes, to allow the entry of "foreign troops" into Helsingfors was quite a different matter. That was "merely" Finland, and if the German imperialists in exchange for a signed scrap of "peace" paper wanted that *foreign* country, "good and well, let them take revolutionary Finland"! Proletarian Esthonia and Latvia were worth sacrificing "for a good peace"—after all, both were *foreign* countries. Even the Ukraine, though closest to Great Russia geographically, ethnologically and linguistically, still was not *Russia* and could be given up to the imperialist bandits in exchange for "peace." But to allow a handful of "foreign troops" in *Moscow*—definitely and peremptorily, NO! *Moscow* was neither Helsingfors nor Kiev. Had the Germans insisted, Lenin would have mobilized the masses and would have applied a ruthless scorched-earth policy—a policy directly opposite from the one he had pursued in the Brest situation: "We would have been forced to reply to such a step, as we reply to the revolt of the Czechoslovaks and to the war action of the British in the North, with intensified mobilization, a call that all adult workers and peasants put up an armed resistance, and in the event of necessity of retreat, with destruction by means of fire of all the stores

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

without any exception, especially food supplies, in order that they should not fall into the hands of the enemy." *(Ib.)*

During Brest Lenin had *abstained* from voting on the question of destruction of military property and had fought bitterly against the Bukharinites in support of his policy of handing over the Ukraine, the "bread basket of Europe," to the German imperialists. But then the Brest terms did not contain a clause that the German Embassy in Moscow be guarded by a few German soldiers!

Counterfeit "revolutionary" policies reveal at one time or another their counter-revolutionary essence. Nothing exposes so glaringly the fraudulent nature of Lenin's Brest policy as his stand on the issue of a German military guard for the German Embassy in Moscow. It will suffice to make a comparison between the strength of the Bolshevik State before the conclusion of the Brest "peace" and that prevailing in July. Prior to the "peace" the Bolshevik power had reached the Pacific, and in Europe it included Esthonia, Latvia, Finland, the Ukraine, and had scored telling victories on the Don, Kuban and in the Caucusus, the White Guard resistance disintegrating shortly after the suicide of General Kaledin (Feb. 12, 1918). The Bolsheviks had perhaps ten million soldiers (Lenin, *C. W.* R. XVI, 66). When one surveys the military and economic position of the Bolshevik State in July 1918, only five months after Trotsky had manipulated the Hoffmann advance, one beholds a tragic picture of chaos, dismemberment and ruin. The Czechoslovaks had cut off Siberia, the Urals and the Trans-Volga region and were marching victoriously on to Simbirsk and Kazan. The Russian Far East had been occupied by the Japanese and other Allied troops. The Ukraine, Crimea, Don and Kuban were in the hands of the Germans. From the North, basing themselves on Murmansk and Archangel, the Allied forces were advancing toward Vologda to make a junction with the Czechoslovaks and SRs who were moving in from the east. Petrograd was menaced by the Finnish bourgeoisie. The Baku Soviet leaned toward the British. From the South and Southwest the Russian White Guard Armies cut off railroad communications between Moscow and Tsaritsin (June 13, 1918). In Northern Caucusus the Sovnarkom's forces suffered a heavy defeat (July 10-14). A serious White Guard-Right SR insurrection had broken out in Tambov (June 17), Yaroslavl (July 6-23), with other uprisings in Arzamas, Rybinsk, Murom. The Left SR Muraviev opened the Czechoslovak Front on the Volga (July 10). Within the narrow circle around Moscow and Petrograd the Left SRs, though suppressed, still seethed with rebellion. Kulak risings occurred in a vast number of places. The October Army had been disbanded; the Red Army was still a weak skeleton organization, honeycombed with White Guard officers and convulsed with anti-Bolshevik revolts (Saratov, May 16, and others). Through the Brest Treaty the Bolshevik State had been deprived of most of its food sources, of 54% of its industries and 89% of its coal mines *(U. S. Foreign Relations, 1918, Russia,* I, 490). Most

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Russian armaments were lost to Germany. And at this extremely difficult period of the "breathing spell" Lenin showed an iron determination to resist the Kaiser on the question of permitting a small German military unit to guard the German Embassy in Moscow! In his determination Lenin was willing to sacrifice everybody's life including his own: "When the Germans wanted to send their soldiers here to Moscow, we said we would rather all perish in battle but to that we would not agree." (XV, R. 553)

During the Brest period Lenin, without asking the workers and peasants—indeed, acting against their wishes—insisted that they would rather accept an annexationist "peace" than a revolutionary war. Now, also without consulting the masses, or the Bolshevik Party, Lenin with burocratic nonchalance took it for granted that the Russian masses would have supported his policy of official war against German imperialism on the "battalion" issue. "War in that event would have been for us a fatal but absolute and unconditional necessity, but this revolutionary war the workers and peasants would have fought to the last breath shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet power." (387)

During the Brest period, to mollify the Bolshevik membership and the Soviets, Lenin had said reassuringly that he himself stood for the principle of revolutionary war but he made the application of this principle contingent on the need to *prepare* such a war. The word "prepare" figured largely in his argument against Bukharin. During the "battalion" crisis, however, though the Russian masses were in a far less advantageous position to carry on such a war, or any war, Lenin never uttered the word "prepare." Without any equivocation he now posed the issue before the German imperialists: withdraw the demand for sending soldiers to guard your Embassy or "revolutionary" war.

During the Brest period, to break the general spirit of the Russian masses for revolutionary war, Lenin declared in his Theses on Peace, "If the German revolution should break out during the next three or four months, then, perhaps, the tactic of immediate revolutionary war would not ruin our Socialist revolution." And he presented the following argument against the revolutionary war: "Under the circumstances it would be an absolutely inadmissible tactic to stake the fate of the Socialist revolution which has already begun in Russia only on the proposition whether the German revolution will begin at the nearest date within a period of weeks. Such a tactic would be an adventure. We have no right to take a risk." (*Pravda,* Feb. 24, 1918; XV, R. 68). But during the "battalion" crisis Lenin did not raise the question of the date of the revolution in Germany. He declared irrevocably that he was prepared to stake the fate of the revolution in Russia and his own life in resisting the relatively minor demand of German imperialism "for, objectively speaking, it would mean the beginning of the occupation of *Russia* by foreign troops."

But Lenin's line was really not adventurous and he understood

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

full well that he was staking neither his life nor the "Socialist revolution" in Russia by his resolute stand. The classic lesson of the French Revolution with which Lenin was thoroughly conversant showed that in a war the risk is rather on the side of the power that seeks to crush a people that has just overthrown an old oppressor class. To win an open war against the Russian masses, German imperialism required stability at home and the availability of a mighty military machine. Instead, its weakness at home was starkly evident and its powerful Army was locked in battle in France. Lenin was really more concerned with the Volga front than with the German imperialists. Trotsky records Lenin's words:

" 'We must mobilize everybody and everything and send them to the front,' said Lenin. 'We must take from behind the "veil" all troops capable of fighting and throw them on the Volga.'

"I remember that the thin cordon of troops opposing the German occupation district in the west was called the 'veil.'

" 'And the Germans?' they said to Lenin.

" 'The Germans will not move, they have other things to do, and they are themselves interested that we should finish with the Czecho-Slovaks.' " *(Lenin,* 159)

The German imperialists too understood the situation. It was not difficult to grasp that Lenin's dramatic shift to a war against them would have swung the Czechoslovak soldiers to his support for they had begun to hate him only because he had concluded the Brest "peace" and disrupted the Austro-Russian Front. The Czech Bolshevik soldiers in the regiments of the Legion would have gotten the upper hand and diverted the force from combatting the Red Army to an attack on German imperialism. The Left SRs would have instantly changed their front, fighting the Germans instead of the Bolsheviks, for this was the issue on which they had broken with Lenin. And the Allied governments would have risked a revolutionary storm at home if they had attempted to wage war against the Bolshevik power after it had undertaken an all-out struggle against Germany. Surely the fictitious tale about Lenin and Trotsky being paid agents of the Kaiser could never have been even whispered. As it was, the story, manufactured before October, was given great impetus by the international bourgeoisie, both in the Allied countries (U. S. Ambassador Francis' telegram to Washington, Feb. 1918; *Sisson Documents),* and even in Germany. (Lenin XV, R. 621)

So despite the fact that their Ambassador and a personal friend of the Kaiser had just been assassinated and Lenin was unable to guarantee the safety of their nationals in Bolshevik Russia, the German imperialists withdrew the demand. Lenin stated in *Pravda* of July 21, 1918: "There are signs that the German government is prepared to come to terms and may renounce the despatch of a battalion of German soldiers in Moscow. The Soviet Government has categorically rejected the request of the German government, even if it

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

leads to war." *(C. W.* XXIII, 157). Chicherin in an article "Two Years of Soviet Russia's Foreign Policy" (15) stated: "Confronted with our resolute refusal, the German Government immediately gave in." *(Izvestia,* Nov. 6-7, 1919)

Once the demand was withdrawn, Lenin resumed his obsequious attitude toward German imperialism. And this reversion to the former policy represents further evidence that his "timidity" was a disguise, that he really did not fear a fight against German imperialism, at that time or back in January-February 1918, and that all the territorial, political and economic gains they had received from Lenin were acquired in harmony with his policy. He now showed willingness to squeeze out of the Russian masses more sacrifices to satisfy the German plunderers' thirst for raw materials and gold. On August 27, 1918 a new Bolshevik capitulation was effected by the conclusion of a Supplementary Treaty. Behind the back of the Soviets and the Bolshevik Party membership, without the consent of the masses who were very much concerned in the matter, Lenin pledged to pay the Kaiser, in addition to previous obligations, six billion marks, one billion of which was to go to the White Guard Finland and the Ukraine. (Magnes, 187). "The first installment, 42,860 kilograms in gold, and 90,900,000 rubles in paper was to be paid, and actually was paid, on September 10; the second installment on September 30, and three more at intervals of a month." *(Ib.)* It is noteworthy that while Lenin abrogated the Turkish clauses of the Brest Treaty and thus showed no fear that Germany would make a military effort to enforce them, he continued paying German imperialism. Chicherin reported: "On the 20 of September we informed Turkey that we consider the Brest Treaty annulled by her and already non-existent between Turkey and Russia. Regarding Germany we loyally fulfilled our obligations under the agreements of August 27 and the first installments of gold were paid by us at the specified dates." *(Two Years of Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia,* R. 21; *Izvestia,* Nov. 9, 1919)

Momentarily the German imperialist vampires appeared satisfied. Among some elements in Berlin ruling circles there developed a feeling that from the point of view of German interests no other Russian regime would do. They looked favorably on the Lenin-Trotsky government which was proving every day that its verbal expression of revolutionary principles formed no obstacles to practical counter-revolutionary deals. On the day after the Bolshevik gold had been turned over to the German Government, General Hoffmann made the following entry in his diary: "The Bolsheviks are clever and know how to touch us. Now that they have begun to pay, the Foreign Office and the Reichstag are, of course, strongly for supporting the Bolsheviks, without regard to what the future may bring." *(War Diaries and Other Papers,* I, 236)

While things were beginning to look dark for the German imperialists in the West and inside Germany itself, their bright spot was in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Russia. True, Mirbach could not be brought back to life, but gold from Lenin was pouring in as well as one-fourth of Baku's total production of oil (Article XIV, Supplementary Treaty). In return, as Lenin told the Russian masses, he secured a *promise* that German imperialism would restrain the Finnish White Guards, and other similar promises and "guarantees."

Lenin paid the second gold installment on September 30, 1918, approximately six weeks before the overthrow of the Kaiser Government. Did Lenin understand that at the very moment he was delivering the gold to the German imperialists they were on their last legs and could never have enforced the payments? Signs were certainly not lacking even for a lesser analytical mind than Lenin's to show that the collapse of German imperialism was imminent. In July 1918 Ludendorff's fifth and final offensive broke down. The Allied grand counter-offensive, now heavily supported by a large American army, was launched on July 18, 1918 and was never halted until the Armistice on November 11, 1918. On September 27, three days before Lenin handed over the second installment, the British pierced the vital Hindenburg Line. Internally the power of the Central Empires was rapidly disintegrating. In March 1918 strikes broke out in Austria and Hungary, severing communications between Vienna and Budapest. On May 20, 1918 martial law was proclaimed in Prague. In his report at the Fourth Conference of Moscow Trade Unions on June 27, 1918, Lenin observed: "In Austria things have again reached the pitch of hunger riots, of nationwide mass outbursts of indignation." *(C. W.* XXIII, 91). Early in August 1918 a fresh mutiny broke out in the German Navy. Lenin was quite clear that the German imperialists were too impotent to subjugate the Russian masses: "The British and Japanese imperialist brutes are not strong enough to occupy and subjugate Russia. Even neighboring Germany is not strong enough for that, as was shown by her 'experiment' in the Ukraine." (220)

And what was that "experiment" in the Ukraine to which Lenin pointed as proof of weakness of German imperialism? It was another piece of historical testimony to expose the true *Russian* character of Lenin's "peace" policy. With no military aid from the Lenin-Trotsky leadership, the Ukrainian workers and peasants, though defeated again and again, carried on an uninterrupted struggle against German imperialism. The half-million German soldiers brought in to plunder the Ukraine attempted to fraternize with the masses! A brief historical review of the German "experiment" in the Ukraine is contained in the *Notes* to Lenin's *Collected Works:* "The decomposition of the German imperialist army which occupied the Ukraine in 1918 had begun long before the November revolution in Germany, occurring under the influence of the revolutionary movement and civil war in Russia. The November revolution accelerated the process which had commenced long before. The German soldiers refused to fight the Ukrainian insurgents and the Red Army advancing from Kursk, and demanded demobiliza-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tion and return home. In the majority of army units there were elected Soviets of soldiers deputies and regiment committees. The demand of the Entente to halt the evacuation of the German troops from the Ukraine until the arrival of strong Allied forces was not carried out despite all insistence of the German command because of the refusal of the soldier masses who fraternized with the insurgents and Red Army men." (XVI, R. 509)

Lenin thus knew in August-September 1918 that German imperialism was rapidly sinking. Yet he burdened the Russian masses, by arbitrary burocratic will, with greater and greater economic tribute to the Kaiser Government. But there was a definite limit which Lenin would not overstep. He would not permit what in his interpretation would have been an *objective* occupation of Russia. Uritsky was correct when at the Central Committee session of January 24 (11) 1918 during the discussion of the war issue, he said of Lenin: ". . . he looks at the matter not from the angle of international revolution but from the angle of Russia." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* VII, 453)

7. *Safeguarding German Property Rights in Russia*

Lenin's economic capitulation to the Kaiser took on various forms. One of them was the obligation to protect the interests of the German investments in Russia. Chicherin reported at the Fifth Congress of Soviets in July 1918: "If we nationalize these branches of industry, then we are compelled to compensate the German subjects for their losses . . . All such impracticable actions give cause for protest from the German government and also cause for conflicts which increase the obligations excessively. The question of computations of the damage caused by us, the question of the financial liquidation of our obligations which were caused by these actions and the question of the regulation of our social legislation relative to foreign subjects, demand immediate decision." (Cited by Fraina, 418)

The ripe fruit of the October Revolution was the indirect enslavement of the Russian masses to German imperialism. Apart from all other obligations, Lenin forced the Russian masses to pay for the liquidation of German properties carried out by the Tsar during the war from 1914 to 1917. Chicherin reported this to the Fifth Congress of Soviets: "The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk obligated us to pay indemnity for the losses of German citizens during the war through the liquidation of their undertakings or through the cessation of payments of dividends and interest on loans. The execution of these obligations demanded from us the creation of a department that should investigate the German claims. This department is now in existence as the Liquidation Department of the People's Commissariat of Trade and Industries, and it functions *with success.*" (417-418)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

8. *The Russian Workers' Blood Payment for Brest*

A war conducted in the interest of a special group vastly strengthens this group and enables it to engage in arbitrary conduct. When the Russian Civil War was drawing to an end, *Petrogradskaya Pravda* under Zinoviev's control aptly indicated the function that the Civil War had performed for the Lenin-Trotsky burocracy: "While the war storm has been raging, the severity of the requirements of the Civil War has led to a series of eliminations of features of democracy also for the working class, the subject of power in the Soviet State. In the proletarian-peasant Republic, which has been transformed into a military camp, there have reigned the iron laws of war." (Jan. 16, 1921). These iron laws were burocratically forged and dictatorially applied by the narrow Sovnarkom circle.

One of the numerous illusions which the Stalin, Trotsky and bourgeois historians have weaved into a colorful fiction proclaims that Lenin, before and after assuming power, expected to secure peace for Russia. Lenin's burocratic requirement, after he had dismissed the true Soviet Government and laid the groundwork for the appointive system of individual dictators, *demanded* not peace but *militarism* and *war*—and a perpetual threat of war between the Bolshevik State and international imperialism. Had the German and the Allied and Russian bourgeoisie desisted from military activity against the Bolshevik State—an utterly impossible eventuality—there would have been no logical ground for Lenin to institute a reign of "the iron laws of war" and "a series of eliminations of features of democracy."

The Stalin, Trotsky and bourgeois writers have never established the connection between Lenin's Brest policy and the bursting forth of an astonishing show of strength by the decrepit former Russian ruling classes. During the early weeks of the Bolshevik regime, the Russian bourgeoisie, dislodged and isolated, offered hardly any serious resistance, as Lenin pointed out at the Seventh Congress of the Party on March 7, 1918: "We achieved an easy victory over our Kaledinites and created the Soviet Republic in the face of a resistance that was not even worth serious consideration." (*S. W.* VII, 287) Early in February 1918 the Bolshevik leadership spoke not of a beginning but of the *termination* of the civil war in Russia. In an address to the Berlin and the Vienna Soviets, Zinoviev declared: "Civil war in Russia is nearing its end in the complete victory of the social revolution." (Quoted by Magnes 116). In the Notes to Volume VII of Lenin's *Selected Works* (504), we read about "the period of civil war which followed the Brest respite." In truth there was *no civil war* in Russia to speak of prior to the Brest capitulation! The Russian masses actually enjoyed a *genuine breathing spell* which began a few weeks before the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and lasted until the Trotsky-maneuvered Hoffmann advance and the Brest "peace" which ushered

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in all the horrors of the two-pronged imperialist intervention and of a major civil war. Immediately before and after the overthrow of Kerensky no roar of artillery was heard on the Front, no rivers of blood flowed anywhere in Russian territory. The wretched attempts by the Russian bourgeoisie and the landlords to start a civil war were easily smashed with little bloodshed.

With a large amount of factual data at their disposal, Lenin, Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders knew what power revived Russian counter-revolution and gave the initial impulse to the former ruling aristocracy to rise in great strength against the Russian proletariat and peasantry. The power was German imperialism! The Tsarist generals who set out to build a "Volunteer Army" found very few volunteers. "There were only 400 men in the entire Volunteer Army when General Alexeiev laid its foundation." (A. J. Sack, *Birth of the Russian Democracy,* 533). But thanks to the paralysis spread by the Sovnarkom's policy of capitulation to German imperialism the White forces grew during the "peace" that Lenin obtained. "During November and December 1917 the revolution was victorious in the Ukraine. The First All-Ukrainian Congress of Soviets proclaimed Soviet power, and the Rada was compelled to flee from Kiev. The Congress of the Don Cossaks in the Kamenskaya Stanitza declared for Soviet Power. Rostov on the Don and Novocherkask were occupied by Red troops. The chieftain of the Don Force, Kaledin, committed suicide. The 'Volunteer Army' led by General Kornilov, failing to seize Ekaterindar, was forced to seek refuge in the steppes. In was only the German occupation of the Ukraine and Don that gave the counter-revolution there the opportunity to sustain itself. The Rada returned to Kiev and was replaced by Hetman Skoropadsky. General Krasnov established himself on the Don. At the head of the Volunteers, in place of Kornilov who was killed while storming Ekaterinodar, was put General Denikin." (XV, R. "Notes," 650). And where did General Krasnov obtain the material means to organize the Cossak army which served as one of the pillars of the future huge White Guard forces? Lenin knew exactly: "Krasnov built the army on the Don by means of German money." (XVI, R. 83)

However, the war so severely strained the finances of German imperialism that money for the "loans" to Krasnov and other anti-Bolshevik generals had to come from sources outside the Central Empires. Where could the German imperialists find an external coffer from which to draw substantial gold support to aid Russian counter-revolution? The answer is provided by Lenin's gold deliveries to the Kaiser Government.

After the fall of the Kaiser and, logically, the abrogation of the Brest Treaty by the Central Executive Committee of Soviets (Nov. 13, 1918), the duties of rendering support to White Guard elements were taken over by the Allies. Lenin later gave a brief review of the surface events since October, without, of course, revealing the underlying

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

motives that influenced his policy which had brought the protracted Civil War and intervention: "If the revolution in October 1917 instantly secured such successes that toward the Spring of 1918 it appeared to us that war was already ended—in reality war was just starting in its worst form—in the form of civil war. In actuality peace with the Germans signified support by these Germans to the worst elements in the civil war; in fact the then concluded peace with the Germans, which collapsed in the Fall, meant everywhere support to these elements from the Allied powers, who accused us of making peace with the Germans." (XXVII, R. 320; *Pravda,* Nov. 1, 1922)

The original civil war between the Russian masses and the bourgeoisie prior to Brest cost very few lives. Antonov-Ovseenko wrote: "The transfer of power to the Soviets was taking place with the irresistible force of a natural process. In Petrograd our losses during the taking of the Winter Palace were not great. Five sailors and one soldier killed, many slightly injured. On the side of the defenders of the Provisional Government nobody suffered any serious injuries. Relatively bloodless, also, was the transfer of power to the Soviets in Moscow and other centers." *(In 1917,* 324). However, "The revival of the Russian counter-revolution which has already become a corpse . . ." (Chicherin to President Wilson, Oct. 24, 1918) a revival produced by Lenin's Brest policy, cost the Russian masses, who were recruited by the million by both the Sovnarkom dictator and the White Guard dictators, an enormous toll.

While Lenin's deliveries of gold to the Kaiser were of great material value to the Kaledin and Kornilov White Guard forces, a major factor in strengthening them was Lenin's unswerving policy to destroy root and branch all the vestiges of the immense October Army. The Bolshevik sources show that many Army units refused to comply with the Sovnarkom's order to give up their arms. In such cases the Sovnarkom resorted to physical force: "The April-May period was marked with the disarming (often through application of force) of many military detachments of the old army, arriving from the Front in a state of complete disintegration." *(Red Moscow,* R. 643). Lenin even went to the lengths of demobilizing the regular troops directly engaged against the forces of the White Guard generals! "Soviet Russia signed the Brest-Litovsk peace with Germany. Demobilization of the Army was declared. The regular units which operated against Kaledin and Kornilov were disbanded." *(The War Work of the Red Army and Fleet,* 1918-1923, R. 48. Edited by Antonov-Ovseenko and Shaposhnikov)

9. *The Brest-Doomed Four Million Russian Slave-Prisoners of War*

"According to the data of the Central Information Buro worked out by the statistical-information section of the Centroplanbezh, in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

November 1918 the number of registered Russian prisoners of war was 4,153,747." *(Five Years of the Power of Soviets,* R. 273)

The exchange of the Russian prisoners of war for the German was prevented by a technical arrangement between the Kaiser Government and the Lenin-Trotsky regime. Chicherin reported this arrangement to the Fifth Congress in July 1918:

"The question of the return of the prisoners of war and civil prisoners, and the maintenance of them until their return to their countries, played a great part in our relations to Germany and Austria-Hungary . . . There was difficulty with Germany, as the number of our war prisoners in Germany was more than a million, while the number of German prisoners in Russia was but little more than a hundred thousand. As the Russian-German commission in Moscow could not come to an agreement on this question of the basis for an exchange of war prisoners between Russia and Germany, it was referred to the Russian-German commission in Berlin, who adopted the principle of exchanging man for man, in accordance with an ultimatum of the German authorities on June 24. We had to accommodate ourselves to this demand. We are facing a severe struggle for the improvement of the conditions of our war prisoners in Germany, where the majority of them labor under extraordinary severe conditions. We must labor unceasingly so that when the German prisoners of war shall have returned to their country the future return of Russian prisoners occurs in the same period." (Fraina, 420)

The callous burocrats who had turned the revolutionary proletariat of Finland, the Ukraine and other countries over to the German butchers, pretended to struggle against the German imperialists "for the improvement of the conditions of our war prisoners in Germany"! For nearly three years after Brest the Russian prisoners of war were languishing in the imperialist camps. "The conditions of the Russian prisoners of war who remained in the camps of Germany and Austro-Hungary for nearly three years after the conclusion of the Brest Peace was exceptionally distressing. The war prisoners had insufficient food, and were perishing en mass from exhaustion and tuberculosis." *(Five Years of the Power of Soviets,* R. 274). The few who survived returned to a ruined country rocked by bloodshed, devastation, plagues and a terrible famine.

10. *The Brest-Made Famine: 1918-1922*

For many decades Russia had been known as one of the greatest food producing countries of the world, "the granary of Europe." But *Russia* was considered to be not merely the territory of the ancient kingdom of Moscow which was a relatively poor section of the Tsarist Empire, and which, after Brest and for a considerable period of "War Communism," comprised the entire Bolshevik State. Bolshevik Russia, without the rich Ukraine—which up to November 1918 was plundered

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by the Germans, and up to 1920-21 devastated by the marching Red, White and other forces—without Siberia, the Caucasus, the Don, Kuban, the Baltic countries and Belorussia, was an empty hulk, lacking food, fuel and raw materials.

Lenin and Trotsky, the two men chiefly responsible for Brest, never admitted, of course, that Bukharin at the Seventh Congress (March 6-8, 1918) had brilliantly analyzed that Lenin's policy of capitulating to the Kaiser would result in wholesale plunder of Russia by the German imperialists:

"The imperialists of the Austro-German coalition can carry on this war on only one condition: on the basis of a merciless treatment of Russia. In the first place this is simply from economic considerations, for purely economic reasons, because in order to be able to conduct the war against England, Germany must have bread. She cannot conduct the war without it. Consequently, to continue the war Germany will inevitably resort to the most shameless plundering of Russia. This is one point. But there is another reason. A war can be pursued only on condition of having a certain social equilibrium within the country. War is virtually impossible if there is an armed uprising at home. It is necessary, therefore, to defer the armed rising, to extinguish the revolutionary fires. At the present moment the German imperialists have advanced a very definite demand—a demand for Russian grain with which to stifle the threat from below which is growing intense in Germany today." *(Sten. Rep.* 37)

In their Seventh Congress resolution the Bukharinites stated that "The treaty cuts off Russia's revolutionary center from the producing regions which feed her industry." One required no great intelligence to understand that this was so. Lenin handed over the iron and coal areas and the grain-producing regions to the Kaiser who was able to stifle the discontent of the German masses by promising them bread and meat from the Ukraine and coal from the Donets. Meantime the Russian workers were condemned to chronic, prolonged starvation and Russian industry was deprived of fuel and raw materials. In an article printed in *Izvestia* of March 12, 1918, two days before the Lenin majority at the Fourth Congress of Soviets ratified the Brest capitulation, Lenin wrote: "We have been compelled to sign a 'Tilsit' peace. Let us not have self-deceptions. It is necessary to have courage to look the unvarnished bitter truth straight in the face. It is necessary to fathom to the very depth the chasm of defeat, dismemberment, enslavement, humiliation into which we have been pushed."

It was Lenin and Trotsky who pushed the Russian masses into the chasm against which Bukharin had forewarned. Hardly two months had elapsed after the Germans occupied the Ukraine, when a famine, clearly implicit in Bukharin's analysis, descended upon the Russian workers. The Kulaks hid whatever grain they possessed. Speculators took advantage of the desperate food shortage in the cities. On May 9, 1918 the Sovnarkom issued an appeal in which it

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

stated: "Petrograd is experiencing an unprecedented catastrophe. There is no bread. The population is receiving what was left of potato flour and hardtack. The Red Capital is on the brink of ruin from starvation. The counter-revolutionists are raising their heads, inciting the dissatisfied, starving masses against the Soviet Government." *(Documents on the Civil War in SSSR,* R. 148)

Perhaps no better testimony which reveals the Brest origin of the famine exists in the Stalin sources than the following:

"And, indeed, the German imperialists did their utmost to isolate, weaken and destroy Soviet Russia. They snatched from it the Ukraine—true, it was in accordance with a 'treaty' with the White Guard Ukrainian Rada (Council)—brought in their troops at the request of the Rada and began mercilessly to rob and oppress the Ukrainian people, forbidding them to maintain any connections whatever with Soviet Russia. They severed Transcaucasia from Soviet Russia, sent German and Turkish troops there at the request of the Georgian and Azerbaidjan nationalists and began to play the masters in Tiflis and in Baku. They supplied, not openly, it is true, abundant arms and provisions to General Krasnov, who had raised a revolt against the Soviet Government on the Don. Soviet Russia was thus cut off from her principal sources of food, raw material and fuel." *(Hist. of C. P. S. U.* 227-8)

The Sovnarkom's only "remedy" was the use of force against the Kulaks in the grain-poor villages of Central Russia. This policy was actually a cover up of the fact that Petrograd and other industrial cities had grown and functioned on the basis of economic unity with the outlying food-producing territories and could not but starve without those regions, and of the fact that Lenin had deliberately handed over Central Russia's main sources of food, fuel and raw materials to the German imperialists. The starving Bolshevik workers accepted the Sovnarkom's quack remedy of squeezing the Kulaks as a scientifically-proletarian solution to the food crisis. Naturally nothing was accomplished except a bloody war between the workers who went to the villages to seize what little food they could find and the Kulaks and middle peasants who refused to give it up.

Trotsky reached the culminating point in his demagogic attempts to cover up the Brest source of the artificially-created famine when he, quite conscious that it was Lenin who sold the Ukraine, put the blame for the betrayal on the Ukrainian Mensheviks and SRs:

"Who Betrayed the Ukraine?

"To these gentlemen who blame the Soviet power for the famine and who remind us that in the Ukraine there is 500 million puds of grain (they maintain silence about the fact that the Germans are now endeavoring to ship it home to Germany)—to these gentlemen we say: but who opened the gates of the Ukraine to the imperialists? Who called in the Germans? It was the Ukrainian Rada. And who composes

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Ukrainian Rada? The Ukrainian SRs, Mensheviks and similar betrayers." (I, 89)

In that initial stage of the long drawn-out famine, Lenin unwittingly indicated the material, but not the political source of this scourge. "Russia has been afflicted by famine which has been made acute because the violent peace has deprived Russia of the most fertile grain-producing provinces." (Report at the Fourth Conference of Trade Unions and Factory Committees of Moscow, June 27, 1918; XV, R. 336)

The Stalin historians circumvent the burocratic cause and the Brest policy as the mainspring of the four-year Bolshevik famine and tie it to the famines in Tsarist Russia which were, incidentally, far less destructive of life than the one made in Brest. "After the October Revolution the Soviet Republics were confronted in the first years with a famine unknown in the annals of Russian famines. The famine of 1921-22 embraced 35 provinces with a population of 90 million of which no less than 40 million were starving. This famine, coming on the heels of a long series of previous hungry years of the Twentieth Century, of incredible exhaustion of the country by the imperialist war and the succeeding Civil War, represented the most oppressive posthumous heritage of Tsarism. The famine of 1921-22 and its consequences caused the death of five million people." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XVII, 463)

In 1921 the "normal" made-in-Brest famine transformed into an appalling disaster because—most people believed—of the failure of crops in the Volga region. Although on the surface it may seem that the disaster was the handiwork of nature, a closer investigation reveals it to have been one of the tragedies resulting from the Brest crime. *An American Report on the Russian Famine,* printed in 1921 by *The Nation* furnishes ample testimony to the fact that the major catastrophe was caused not so much by the drought of 1920 and 1921 as by the long Civil War which wrecked Russian industry, transport and agriculture. (15, 16, 23). The Commission making the *Report* was extremely friendly toward the Lenin-Trotsky regime but was politically unenlightened and therefore did not understand Brest.

The horrors the Brest crime brought to the Russian masses were vividly portrayed in a Bolshevik publication *Krasnaia Nov:* "More and more reports of corpse-devouring and cannibalism are arriving. The devouring of corpses has become a common phenomenon, but cannibalism too has become an every-day occurrence. There is a hunt after living human beings, after women and children in particular. A man killed his wife and ate her. A mother cut the throat of her child and ate it. A son killed his father and ate him. In the streets of starving cities there appeared 'head hunters.' Cannibalism has become a psychosis. A woman-doctor, arriving in Moscow from the famine-stricken region, is dreaming—of human flesh."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a/5.0
.CCEPT-

(March-April 1922, 325). "On the market in Kazan truffles made of human flesh are being sold." (May-June 1922, 233)

How did the chief perpetrator of the Brest crime react to the terrible sufferings of the Russian masses? In March 1920, two years after Lenin had inflicted his "breathing spell" of blood and starvation upon the masses, he stated at the Ninth Party Congress: "And we declare that the masses will starve until the Red Army triumphs. It was necessary that the vanguard of the working class should make this sacrifice." *(S. W.* VIII, 93). "We do not promise to save the country from starvation immediately." (95)

When Lenin and Trotsky betrayed the Ukraine to the Kaiser's puppet Vinnichenko, *a betrayal in the full sense of the word,* as Trotsky himself stated—when they turned over to German imperialism grain, gold, coal, oil and other important products and supplies, they ushered in an appalling stage of history for the Russian workers and peasants which, mounting in bloodshed, disease and hunger climaxed in the nightmare of cannibalism.

CHAPTER IX.

CONSOLIDATING THE NATIONAL-BUROCRATIC POWER

1. *Burocratism Between the Seventh and the Eighth Congress of the Bolshevik Party*

REVIEWING LENIN'S politics, Preobrajensky, an outstanding Bolshevik economist, one of the future signers of the "Letter of 46" which started the Trotsky "Opposition" in 1923, intimated that the programmatic line adopted at the Seventh Congress in March 1918 had not been followed by the Lenin-Trotsky leadership. That line, just as the 1917 program of building democratic workers' power and achieving revolutionary world peace, had been adopted under Lenin's personal supervision, and had been quietly buried by him without a word of repudiation. Preobrajensky implicitly drew a perspective of a personal dictatorship over the Bolshevik Party: "The new course has not been outlined by the Congress; and soon, evidently, the Party will have to solve the question of to what degree the dictatorship of individuals will be extended from the railroads and other branches of economy to the Russian Communist Party." *(Kommunist,* #4, July 1918). What appeared obvious to the Left Communists, and no doubt to Lenin and Trotsky, was that the Russian proletarian society, only several months old, was already divided into the privileged few and the underprivileged many. Sorin, another Left Communist, voiced the need of the hour in these words: "It is necessary to struggle against the utilization of the October Revolution in the interests of a small group." *(Ib.)*

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

By the first anniversary of the October Revolution the burocratic crust had become thick and hard. Invested with enormous power, Trotsky on November 9, 1918 delivered an arrogant speech at the Sixth Congress of Soviets, initiating the lower burocrats into the mechanics of the Sovnarkom administration: "Not all Soviet workers have understood that our administration has been centralized and that all orders issued from above must be final." (Quoted in *Stalin*, 291). He followed this up with a tyrant's threat to crush all those who would not conform with the burocratically-centralized power: "We shall be pitiless with those Soviet workers who have not yet understood; we will remove them, cast them out of our ranks, pull them up with repressions." *(Ib.)*

Trotsky blandly assures the reader that "This was aimed at Stalin . . ." but his threatening words clearly show that he meant the workers and lesser functionaries. Trotsky was not in a position to cast Stalin "out of our ranks" or pull him up with repressions because Stalin himself was one of those who issued orders from above, was a member of the Sovnarkom and other high ruling bodies, and, like Trotsky, exercised the power of removal and appointment.

At the Sixth Congress of the Soviets, on November 6, 1918, three days before Trotsky delivered his sharp threats, Lenin had made a speech which was in contrast with the burocratic reality of the Sovnarkom regime. He said: "We possess a fund of fighting experience. That fund of experience provided a striking corroboration of the fact that the organized workers created a Soviet government without burocrats, without a standing army, and without privileges (privileges in practice designed for the bourgeoisie)" *(S. W.* VI, 495). Yet a short two and a half months later, in criticising the thesis of Ignatov who attacked the burocratic aspects in the Soviet system, Lenin made the following admission: "We are being eaten up by burocracy, which is very difficult to cope with." (Speech at the Moscow City Conference of the Russian Communist Party, January 18, 1919. *C. W.* XXIII, 496)

The official Bolshevik press made similar admissions: "Everybody knows that into all our Soviet institutions have crept a tremendous number of all sorts of scoundrels and rogues." *(Krasnaya Gazeta*, Feb. 7, 1919). "We all complain about the plethora of hooligans and scoundrels in our ranks but we do nothing to get rid of that filth." *(Ib.)* "Moreover, if occasionally one establishment throws some scoundrel out, there is at once found another establishment which immediately picks him up and assigns him to a responsible post. And often instead of punishment the hooligan receives a promotion." *(Ib.)*

And what measures did Lenin propose? To abolish the system of appointments? Just the opposite, to *continue* that burocratic system, and to recruit into the burocracy workers from the ranks: "We must *appoint* to the government offices more workers of the average type, who would learn their jobs from the experts and be able to replace them and do the practical work independently." (Speech at the Mos-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cow City Conference of the R. C. P. Jan. 18, 1919. *C. W.* XXIII, 496. Our emph.—G. S.)

One, Menitsky, writing in *Pravda* of February 18, 1919, probably by way of reply to Lenin, stated: "And when now, in a desire to become extricated from burocratism which has entangled all of Soviet Russia, people wish to pour into all institutions fresh forces from the proletarian masses, we must state that salvation does not lie in such measures. Moreover, we assert that such measures will only increase the numbers of burocrat-chinovniks and probably from the ranks of the coarse and the ignorant. This will increase the proportion of representatives of Soviet power degenerating into definite satraps and shut-your-mouth police bullies. This course does not lead us toward our aim but on the contrary away from it."

Workers were drawn into the machinery of the State, but they merely served as a shield for Lenin and the burocracy, supplying him with the "proof" that his old proletarian-democratic thesis was actually being carried out. They in turn were transformed into State burocrats and the system was strengthened by taking on a "proletarian" color. Later, under Stalin, hundreds of thousands of workers were drawn into the State institutions. The Bolshevik Party, especially after the "Lenin Recruiting," was largely proletarian in composition but Russian-nationalist and burocratic in political content.

Although Menitsky was far from offering the solution to the burocratic problem, his observation was correct. Approaching the matter a little more clearly, Menitsky cited the well-known explanation: "It is no secret to us that 'existence determines consciousness.' Once we put a person in conditions of creating a burocrat, then sooner or later he must become one." *(Ib.)* Thus, in order to understand what happened to a worker appointed to a State post it was not necessary to wait until Lenin himself stated later, "When you are appointed to some office you become burocratized." Any Menitsky knew this years previously.

Between the Seventh and Eighth Congresses of the Bolshevik Party the system of appointments made colossal inroads into whatever remained of the democratic-proletarian structure which had spontaneously arisen in 1917. As an indication of the extent these inroads reached, suffice it to show that even in the Baltic Fleet, the glory of the revolutionary days of 1917, the Lenin-Trotsky regime smashed the vestiges of the sailors democracy. "By the order of the Revolutionary Soviet of the Republic to the Baltic Fleet the ship committees are abolished. In their stead commissars are appointed to the ships." *(Krasnaya Gazeta,* Feb. 8, 1919)

2. *Burocratic Vanity*

Stalinist self-glorification on a scale no Byzantine or Roman emperor ever attempted is familiar to many people. There is an endless number of objects in the Soviet Union bearing the *Stalin* prefix. Cities

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

alone represent an impressive array: Stalingrad (formerly Tsaritsin), Stalinobad (Dyushambe), Stalin (Yuzovka), Stalinir (Tskinvali) Stalinsk (Novo-Kuznetsk). Thousands of villages, stations, junctions, roads, streets, buildings, factories, clubs bear the name of Stalin. The highest peak in the Soviet Union is called Mount Stalin. Stalin's henchmen also share in this revolting personal aggrandizement and there are long lists of objects named after them.

When did this burocratic feature arise? Trotsky in *My Life* gives an instance: "As soon as Lenin fell ill, Stalin through his allies had Tsaritsin changed to Stalingrad." (II 175). But Trotsky omits the fact that approximately at the time Tsaritsin was renamed Stalingrad, Gatchina was christened *Trotskoye* (1922), and was so known until the exile of Trotsky to Turkey (1929) when it was named Krasnoarmeyskoe *(Webster's New International Dictonary,* 3079; *Enc. Br.* XXII, 497). This form of personal corruption originated not under Stalin's dictatorship but under Lenin and Trotsky. Soon after October the Party burocrats commenced to name streets and other public objects after Lenin and Trotsky. On April 21, 1918 Gorki's *Novaya Zhizn* remarked sarcastically: "It is very touching—no denial—that the newly-formed revolutionary Kegegomel regiment has named itself 'The Trotsky Chief Regiment.' The Kotov factory of Zamoskvorets region was rechristened 'The L. D. Trotsky Red Corner Factory.'" Stalin in 1918 issued an official order regarding a number of military units combined into the Tenth Army under the command of his crony, Voroshilov: "All the above-named army units henceforth to bear the title The Group of Comrade Voroshilov." *(Documents,* etc. 237)

The names of the leading burocrats of the Bolshevik Party were studiously popularized and occasionally in the presence of the individuals themselves. For instance, when Kamenev visited the Wrangel Front he stopped off in the port of Nikolaev where "I laid a keel for the submarine which the comrades christened 'Kamenev'; in the near future it will join its comrade, the submarine 'Trotsky.'" (Kamenev, *Krasnaya Gazeta,* Oct. 30, 1920). Many locomotives bore the names of leading Bolshevik burocrats. In December 1921 the Kolomen Plant completed the locomotive "Rykov." During the Civil War there was a "model armored train named for Lenin." *(My Life,* II, 151)

CHAPTER X.

THE EIGHTH CONGRESS OF THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

1. *Voices of Criticism*

THE EIGHTH PARTY CONGRESS (March 18-23, 1919) gives an insight to the depth of the depravity the ruling burocrats had reached. Also, one gleans an idea of what the members of the Party who opposed the Sovnarkom's policies thought. Lenin and Trotsky knew

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

/5.0
CEPT-

that the Congress would serve as a rallying point for the discontented and recalcitrant section of the organization. They entered the arena fully determined to continue unfolding their national-burocratic policy.

As ever the chief reporter to the Congress was Lenin. Although only two months earlier he had stated "We are being eaten up by burocracy," one does not find even a remotest hint in his report that the burocratic disease afflicted the whole organism of the State.

Sapronov directed the attention of the Congress to the fact that the prevailing policy was a far cry from the Party's programmatic pronouncements: "Our Program speaks of conducting a struggle against burocratism, a struggle against officialdom, etc. Yet reality and the policy which is being carried out in life do not correspond to what is written in the Program and in every one of our resolutions. Officials are appointed from above and are dispatched to the localities." *(Sten. Rep.* 272). Without actually naming the chief architects of the burocratic administrative system, Sapronov attacked their violations of the electoral rights of the localities and the system of appointing individuals with dictatorial power over the locally-elected *Ispolcoms,* Executive Committees of the Soviets: "Perhaps there is a need to arrest or dissolve the Ispolcoms, but the right to carry out such acts must not be vested in one person. We know of instances of people being expelled from the Ispolkoms for not carrying out their tasks, for incapability, for disruptive activity, yet the Center then appointed these people to responsible posts and sent in officials who also refused to submit to the Ispolcom." *(Ib.).* Sapronov objected to the appointment of officials from above, exactly as Lenin had done in 1917 before October: "The right of elections belongs to the Ispolkoms, to the Congresses, to the Soviets and other institutions. But by no means should these persons be appointed from the Center." (274). Sapronov indicated that he had clashed with the supporters of the Center when he had argued for local democratic rights: "When we object we are told: 'You want to create your own provincial State, a State within a State.' Nothing of the kind. We recognize unconditionally that there must be centralization and work must be done on a State scale. But it is wrong to reach the point of thinking of planting officials from the Center everywhere from top to bottom and to consider that everything will be well." (273)

Another opposition speaker, Ignatov, registered the fact that the Bolshevik Party was now moving along a different path from the one foreshadowed in Lenin's pre-October slogan "All power to the Soviets"! "Comrades, Comrade Lenin in his thesis spoke of the need of attracting the wide masses of toilers into participating in Soviet work. In that respect our original slogan 'All power to the Soviets' reflected the essence of this thesis. But as time went on, the course of our work developed somewhat differently. We deviated from our original path and began to build our Soviet differently. We fixed in

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

our Constitutions specific propositions, but from these propositions we have departed. If we now must carry on a struggle against burocratic oppression in the central and in the local institutions, then we must seek the causes of this burocratism in the fact that we, indeed, have built our Soviet apparatus incorrectly." (170)

Many bitter truths fell upon the ears of the delegates of the Eighth Congress. "The Congresses and the Soviets in the districts are gradually deprived of their rightful role." (Ignatov). "The Soviets and the Party organizations have acquired a burocratic character." (Sapronov, 146). "Our apparatus is being built in such a way that the element of election is being relegated to the background. Instead, the principle of appointment is coming to the fore." (Ignatov, 170). "The Soviets are torn away from the practical work, proletarian elements elected by the masses are therefore removed from exercising direct guidance. Not only are the masses not being drawn into the work of construction but quite the opposite, *we* are beginning to break away from *them*." (Ignatov. Our emph.—G. S.)

Osinsky touched upon the right of the membership of the Bolshevik Party to participate in hammering out the Party policy through a general, democratic discussion. He stated that the development "has led to the terrible lowering of the level of consciousness of the Party workers. Comrade Lenin has given a flattering evaluation of the present moment, but the Party masses are in confusion, they posses no political horizon. In consequence, willy-nilly the ideological side of the Party work cannot but be in a dying state. This fact we must register." (142). In the long list of specific features recited by Osinsky was the recognition of the putrefaction of the Bolshevik Party itself: "This explains the degeneration of the Party now taking place. There is no life in the Party organizations. The Party is being filled with trash, with people who possess membership cards but nothing in their heads. The Party is passing through a stage of stagnation." (143). Osinsky, further, indirectly charged that the Lenin-Trotsky leadership had abandoned "the old Communist habit of discussing questions as they should be discussed." In another place, indirectly, he accused Lenin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Stalin and other top leaders of being the *creators* of a burocratic machine along bourgeois lines: "At the present time the Party comrades of long standing have created a whole chinovnik apparatus constructed essentially on the old pattern. An official hierarchy has been created. In the beginning of the Revolution, when we advanced a demand for a government-Commune, the following conditions were part of that demand: all officials must be elected and must be responsible to the electoral institutions. Factually we are now faced with a situation where the lower official, functioning in a province or district and allegedly responsible to his commissariat, in most cases is responsible to no one. This to a great degree explains the abuses committed by 'people with

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

mandates.' On such a basis develops an arbitrary administration." (162)

Osinsky declared that the burocratic concentration had permeated the authority of the Bolshevik State beyond "safe" limits: "The solution of all the important questions of the State rested in the hands of the elective boards which were exceedingly close to the population and were receiving their authority directly from the population. Precisely within these elective nuclei was concentrated the entire power from top to bottom, and in such circumstances there was no room for arbitrariness of burocratism. However, as I have already stated, at a certain period there arose and grew firm the other tendency: the gathering of authority in the hands of very narrow nuclei, in the hands of only the executive organs and even individuals. Inevitably that had to bring forth dangerous consequences. In this respect to go beyond a certain borderline, to allow an excessive concentration of authority, in the given moment, is to create a defect in the very scheme of the mechanism. This must lead to the development of personal methods in politics and to burocratism. Every man is weak, and the absence of public control and comradely supervision leads to a situation where the man imperceptibly becomes corrupt. Such consequences can be avoided only if the limit is not overstepped and if extraordinary circumstances and extraordinary strain of every nerve safeguard against the burocratic infection. And it is necessary to record the fact that with us the limits with respect to the concentration of authority have already been overstepped." (262-3)

Dramatic as these words sounded, the whole approach of the oppositionists was of a general, abstract nature. Osinsky blamed no one for the burocratic development; he indirectly even appealed to the Lenin-Trotsky leadership to call a halt: "And if we, comrades, do not change the policy than the further we go the more deplorable will be the results. Because if the commissions of power are concentrated past the limit and without necessity in the hands of individuals such a policy leads directly to arbitrary methods and burocratism. If at present there is a notable stagnation in the activity of the Soviet mechanism, if we observe a multitude of infamous acts committed by our commissars, if there is advanced against us the slogan 'down with the commissarautocracy'—an unscrupulous slogan but which, without doubt, meets with success—then this is to be explained by the fact that the period when the dictatorship had to be carried out only through military forms has been outlived and the preservation of these forms leads to the deterioration of our State mechanism." (264)

One delegate, Mgeladze, attempted to define the meaning of the term *burocrat* in relation to a ruling class: "A burocrat is a person belonging to the ruling class, a person advanced to power by the ruling class, but who broke away from his class and decided that he can manage given tasks without the assistance of his class." (182). He drew the attention of the Congress to Zinoviev's exposition of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

burocratic decay of the Second International and indicated that the Bolsheviks were burocrats and stood aloof from the proletarian mass: "In Europe we had a workers aristocracy and burocracy which polluted the Second International. I call attention of the comrades to a good book by Comrade Zinoviev: *War and the Crisis of Socialism.* In that book Comrade Zinoviev presents a correct understanding of what a burocrat and an aristocrat is, and in that book, comrades, you will find an explanation of that phenomenon which deserves utmost attention. That thin layer of advanced workers which was carried forward by the revolution is at present breaking itself away from the working masses. Our Party comrades have become burocrats and are separating themselves from the masses." *(Ib.)*

The Bolshevik leaders, Mgeladze added, "forgot" the simple moral obligation of being honest with the workers: "It must be said openly that we have broken away from the masses, we have forgotten how to speak to the masses openly and honestly. There were instances when at meetings in Moscow we feared to bring up the question of supplies. We feared to speak to the masses openly. We must confess that a tendency exists to hush up sharp issues at big meetings." *(Ib.)*

In the separation of interests which divided the officials of the Lenin-Trotsky regime from the workers, Riazanov perceived a very sinister meaning: "In any event, we must reduce the antagonism which exists between the Soviet power and the workers and which is more terrible than ten or fifteen petty-bourgeois or peasant uprisings." (61)

A truly shocking picture of the moral depravity and burocratic corruption of the Bolshevik Party was drawn by Nogin. It must be firmly borne in mind that his appalling story was not about the Stalinist Party of two decades later but about the *Party of Lenin and Trotsky* only a little more than a year after October:

"Our Party has deteriorated, the functionaries in localities and in the center conduct themselves in such a way as to disgrace the name of the Party. It is necessary to say this at the Congress not to maintain silence about it. In our Commission for building the Party which is attached to the Central Committee—it is regrettable that the Commission did not have the opportunity to conclude its work as it should have—in this Commission we received such an endless number of horrifying facts about drunkenness, debauchery, graft, brigandism and senseless actions on the part of many functionaries that our hair stood on end when we heard the reports of the representatives of the Cheka from local organizations and individual comrades. We must uncover the causes for these phenomena. And that debauchery and drunkenness which exist we must uproot. We must at this Congress compel our comrades to adopt the strictest decision in accordance with which all those who disgrace the name of the Party must be at once eliminated. I believe, comrades, that we must, above all else, establish the fact that to our great regret we took very few measures which would assist in restoring the health of our Party. Too late did

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

we begin to uncover 'small defects of the mechanism' in our Party ranks. We did not publish this material. But we have such a colossal number of facts about individual comrades that much of it ought to be made public.

"We must recognize that we do not have an institution which would educate our functionaries, the existence of which organization would give us hope that soon we will have new cadres. If we'll turn now to our Party functionaries who participated in creating Party organizations, no matter how sad it is to say, we must admit that the majority of them ceased to be Party functionaries. And if we do not adopt the most determined decision, the further existence of the Party is unthinkable. Not in the sense that the Party as such will die, but in the sense that personally the proletariat will repudiate the Party, and new forces will come in its stead. But that will be painful and costly for the proletariat and we must avoid it with all the means at our disposal. It will be a great crime if the Congress doesn't honestly admit it and adopt measures to overcome these evils of which I have spoken. (Applause)." (145-6)

2. *Zinoviev Takes the Floor*

That the leaders responsible for the burocratic rottenness of the Bolshevik Party and the State felt uncomfortable cannot be doubted. It was impossible to shrug away the reports which added up to an almost incredible picture. Everybody felt that the accusing finger was pointed at Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev and other men of power.

There was no other course for the representatives of power than to a degree to chime in with Mgeladze who said "Comrades, the problem of burocratism is a serious problem. There is in existence a political danger which ruined the Second International. This danger is the degeneration of the Soviet power into a burocratic power." (183). The key burocrat in carrying out the line of pretending agreement with the critics was the Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet and the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the newly-formed Communist International, Zinoviev.

Zinoviev added to the picture etched by other speakers and supplied extremely informative details:

"Let us take the housing question. Without doubt this question is most important to every toiler. Not for nothing did the Paris Commune place it at the top of its work, but the solution of this question was not achieved. We can solve this problem more or less satisfactorily. And this solution would make every working class family feel that the Communist Party and the Soviet power can ease the life of the workers and peasants, and it would do this immediately.

"Yet in this domain we have done very little, and in places conducted a wrong policy. Many people know that in some places in the provinces and sometimes in big centers, the reform in the realm

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the housing question was reduced to the situation wherein the houses were taken from the bourgeoisie and handed over not to the workers but to the Soviet chinovniks. And at times those houses were given not only to the Soviet burocrat but also to his grandmothers, his aunts and godfathers. (Voices: Shame, Shame!). Comrades, there is nothing that can cut the throat of the Party more. Because every craftsman, washer-woman, cabman, every toiling man, who may be with us tomorrow, will not read our Communist program, our resolutions, will not learn about the Third Communist International, but all of them will learn that Soviet chinovniks and Party Communists confiscated such and such a house and settled in it, and also settled their relatives in it, but not letting in the worker, the railroad man, the craftsman, the toiler. All that deals us such a damaging blow, such an injury to the Party that it is difficult to imagine. When I heard in one of the provincial cities that featherbeds were nationalized, I said, 'Well, maybe this is a very big step in the task of nationalization.' Regrettable enough, not a single worker, not a single toiler ever saw those featherbeds. They fell completely and fully into the possession of Soviet burocrats and Communists." (244-45)

Although Zinoviev bluntly rejected the contention of the opposition that the fate of Social Democracy was overtaking the Bolshevik Party, he in the same breath admitted that such a development actually was taking place: "Concerning the old Socialist parties it is possible with figures to prove—and I, incidentally, had occasions to establish this with respect to the German Social Democracy—how petty-bourgeois fellow-travelers, the top sector of labor aristocracy and labor burocracy in the course of decades were creating whole layers embracing tens of thousands and afterward hundreds of thousands of people who, calling themselves social democrats, had their separate caste interests and were turning the Party entirely in a different direction. With this yard-stick we must approach our Party, and, approaching it with this yard-stick, we have a right to say that up to the present no serious danger threatens our Party from that direction.

"That does not mean that all is well. Quite the contrary, in a whole number of places we can already determine the beginning of such a degeneration of the basic nucleus of our organization. In some places it degenerates in the worst direction, in the sense that in various spots the guiding element becomes not that of the workers but of the service-experienced intelligentsia of the Soviet officials, Soviet and Party burocrats who sometimes combine in one the role of chairman of Party committees, chairman of the Soviet, chairman of the Cheka, chairman of the revolutionary tribunal and a whole number of other institutions. Consequently, within one and the same person we have such an accumulation of power which can lead to no good." (241)

Concealing the kernel of the truth, Zinoviev went on attacking

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the manifestations of the reactionary policy he himself doggedly supported: "Indeed, it is impermissible to conceal from the Congress that in certain localities the word 'Commissar' has become a term of abuse, a hateful word." (189)

Hypocritically insisting upon facing the truth, Zinoviev took refuge in telling some of it: "We have come to our Party Congress not for the purpose of praising one another and boasting of the achieved successes but in order to establish that the disease of burocratism is menacing our Party organization also. Party life has become stagnant in a whole number of places. Party organizations in this and that place are sick, general membership meetings are held less and less. And just as in the Soviet organization we witness the tendency of substituting the Soviets with executive committees, so in the Party organizations there is a tendency to substitute a committee for the Party organization." (243)

Zinoviev revealed political prostitution practiced by Party functionaries even in his own domain, the Petrograd section. People who got jobs in State institutions sought to acquire Party membership which carried certain privileges: "There were instances, even in our organization in Petrograd, though our organization is not among the worst, when in the districts Party membership cards were sold, and not at very high prices at that,—for the sum of from 500 to 1,000 rubles. There were instances in Moscow when a man would appear in the District Committee at 8 p.m. to register for membership in the Party, and when told 'come tomorrow' he would answer: 'For heaven's sake, tomorrow I'm already starting on the job. I must have the Party card precisely today.' " (254)

However, the burocratic policy Zinoviev was actually promoting behind the verbal attack on burocratism is plainly seen in his significant statement that the Central Committee of the Party, the very fountainhead of burocratic corruption, would be granted *unlimited power* of appointment and removal of Party functionaries: "We are presenting to the Central Committee the widest opportunity of transferring us to any posts and of availing itself of this right with no limits at all." (248).

Thus did Zinoviev "fight" against burocratism!

3. *The Rabkrin, Politburo, Orgburo and Russianism*

At the Eighth Congress there were announced certain additions to the existing mechanism of power. The intent behind the innovations was to facilitate the concentration of all the threads of control in the hands of the top few. One of the additions was a new Commissariat. Its functions were elucidated by Zinoviev: "We want to create a Commissariat of Socialist Control which would control actually all the parts of our Soviet mechanism, would sink its feelers into all the branches of Soviet construction, and would have a special

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

department engaged in simplifying and improving our machine." (251-2). The "Commissariat of Socialist Control" was given the name of Workers and Peasants Inspection (Rabkrin). Zinoviev revealed the identity of the man to whom Lenin entrusted the new powerful branch of the burocratic apparatus: "It is proposed that at the head of the Socialist Control should stand Comrade Stalin." (192)

Another change was the establishment of a Political Buro composed of five leading people chosen from the Central Committee. The Politburo was to function as the supreme arbiter among the Party burocrats, the highest authority in the Bolshevik State: "The principal questions, the discords, and the conflicts were resolved in the Political Bureau, which from the very beginning played the role of a super-government." (Trotsky, *New Int.*, March 1939)

The creation of the Politburo was condemned by the opposition. Osinsky pointed out that as a consequence the Central Committee would become a mere talk shop: "In other words, the plenum of the Central Committee merely discusses. What it all comes down to is that the Political Bureau of five people decides all the important questions while the plenary session meets for general conversation, for discussion. All of the other fourteen members are thus reduced to the status of second-rate members." (*Sten. Rep.* 278)

Most of the delegates, however, were stooges of the Lenin- Trotsky regime and supported the narrowing down of power over the State and the Party to five men: Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Kamenev and Bukharin.

The Eighth Congress also sanctioned the formation of an Organizational Buro, a branch of the Central Committee of the Party. The Orgburo was to be the supreme machine for appointing, shifting and removing functionaries. It was an alluring place for many a Party burocrat because it carried with it the possibility of selecting and training a cadre of loyal and obedient flunkeys indispensable in the formation of a personal retinue. The factual head of the Orgburo designated backstage by the Lenin-Trotsky Central Committee was Stalin. Another body, the Secretariat, the creation of which was confirmed at the Eighth Congress, was not very long in passing into the orbit of Stalin's influence and gradually was turned by him into an important instrument of his personal power. His greatly enlarged control now included membership in the Central Committee, membership in the all-powerful Politburo, the heading of two People's Commissariats in the Sovnarkom, membership in the Military Council of the Southern Front and dominance of the Orgburo by virtue of the fact that in it he was the sole member of the Politburo. This latter office eventually became the mainstay of Stalin's burocratic power—"The Orgburo was a fortress of Stalin." (*The Case,* 319)

Stalin's power was increased also in the national field. The political decisions of the early period of the Lenin-Trotsky regime had emphasized the "independence" of each "republic" attached to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Russian Bolshevik State. The Communist Parties directing the "republics" were presumably in free collaboration with one another and with the Russian Party on the basis of full equality. "I recall the decision of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party dated May 18, 1918, which recognized the independence of the Communist Party of the Bolsheviks of the Ukraine and its independent entry into the III International, insofar as the Ukraine is an independent State." (Skrypnik, *Sten. Rep. of the Eleventh Congress of the R. C. P.*, 65).

The Eighth Congress took a step to eliminate the few shreds of independence the other Communist Parties still retained and officially subordinated them to the Russian leadership. Lenin covered this Russian-burocratic centralization with a pretense that the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania and Belorussia, recently occupied by the Sovnarkom's forces, were independent countries: "At the present time the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania and Belorussia exist as separate Soviet Republics. In this way at present has been solved the question of forms of State existence. But this does not at all mean that the Russian Communist Party in its turn is to be organized on the basis of a federation of independent Communist Parties. The Eighth Congress of the R.C.P. resolves: there must exist a *single* centralized Communist party with a single Central Committee directing the entire work of the Party in all the parts of the R.S.F.S.R. All decisions of the Russian Communist Party and its leading institutions are absolutely binding upon all the sections of the Party regardless of their national composition. The Central Committees of the Ukrainian, Latvian, Lithuanian Communists have the rights of regional committees of the Party and are completely subordinated to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party." (Lenin, *C. W.* XIX, R. 266). In essence this decision meant complete organizational subordination of all the Communist Parties in the Bolshevik State to Stalin.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ARMY OF THE SOVNARKOM

1. *The Political Secret Behind the "Red Army"*

An indispensable fulcrum of every reactionary regime is the burocratic apparatus of the Army. The French Revolution, (1789-1799) advancing by stages against absolutism and the landed aristocracy, shaped its Army through the merger of the royal battalions with the newly-formed battalions of the National Guard. The royalist military-burocratic command was supplanted by bourgeois elements who filled the many posts left vacant through the continual stream of emigration of the aristocrats. This, largely bourgeois, partly noble but

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

anti-Feudal, crust constituted the officer core of the Army of the Convention. From it, eventually, came the colonels, generals and marshals of the Empire and the Emperor himself.

The French Revolution was bourgeois in character both before and after Thermidor (July 27, 1794). Since the soldier accepted the bourgeois revolution he never counterposed himself to the bourgeois officer corps. The host of careerists in command of the Army devoted itself to the bourgeois order in the struggle against the Feudal reaction at home and abroad, as well as against the immature attempts at the seizure of power by the nascent proletariat of Paris. The Army, therefore, growing more solidified from year to year, went along with every new phase of the bourgeois Revolution, transferring its allegiance from the Girondists to the Jacobins, to the Thermidorians, to the Directory and to Napoleon.

In Russia the soldiers had overthrown the hated burocratic officer caste. Therefore an attempt by the Sovnarkom to impose upon the October Army a burocratic military apparatus would have caused not merely widespread discontent but armed resistance. The transformed Army, as Trotsky indicated, was permeated with the proletarian-democratic, elective spirit, and the twelve million soldiers at the Front and in the rear were organizationally not tied to the persons of Lenin and Trotsky as were the Bolshevik Party members. When Lenin during the Brest period declared "we have no army" it was literally true for the Bolshevik burocrats but was contrary to fact insofar as the masses were concerned. Although Lenin superimposed a few burocrats upon the Army, this immense soldier force was not a docile organization in their hands. Discipline in the October Army was maintained through the democratic method of persuasion, not by threat of physical punishment. The death penalty had been abolished in the Army after the fall of the Tsar. Though restored under Kerensky in July 1917, it was completely eliminated by the soldiers themselves some weeks before October. The first lawmakers in the Sovnarkom, Stalin, Kamenev and Larin simply recognized the existing fact when they issued an official decree on November 8 (October 26) 1917: "Capital punishment, restored by Kerensky on the Front, is hereby abolished."

Abolition of the death penalty in an army and full freedom of discussion deprives an officer of the power to force the soldiers to carry out orders they find objectionable. Lenin's reaction to the decree abolishing the death penalty was reported by Trotsky in 1924: "When he learned of this first legislative act his anger knew no bounds . . . He proposed changing the decree at once. We told him this would make an extraordinarily unfavorable impression. Finally someone said: 'The best thing is to resort to shooting only when there is no other way.' And it was left at that." (*Lenin,* 133-4)

But the Sovnarkom never dared to shoot a single soldier of the October Army. The soldier was completely free to decide his own action. "There is no stick held over the soldiers" Lenin recorded in

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Pravda of February 21, 1918. During the October overthrow a terrific revolutionary-democratic force of world significance was latent within the Army. Owing to the policy of the Sovnarkom this force was limited to the Russian-national arena. The Bolshevik burocrats saw the important role the soldiers had played before October: "The pressure of the twelve-million soldier-mass constituted a factor of extreme acceleration of the Revolution." (Trotsky, *Bull. Opp.* May-June 1931, 10)

Prior to the October Revolution Lenin had advocated an armed force constructed on principles diametrically opposed to the standing army pattern upon which he and Trotsky built the "Red Army." Even the form the Army assumed during October had not been considered in his writings as sufficiently broad in scope. "To the workers it is essential that there should be no army separated from the people; it is essential that the workers and soldiers merge into one truly national militia." (*Pravda,* No. 36, May 3, 1917; *C.W.* XX, Bk I, 230). In those days Lenin did not say "the old Army had to collapse" but urged to "immediately and unconditionally introduce universal arming of the people, merge them with the militia and the army." (161). The Army, which later was deceitfully repainted in Tsarist colors, was to be a component part of the militia: "to organize a national militia, to fuse it with the army (the standing army to be replaced by a general arming of the people)." (141)

Lenin in the April Theses advocated: "All officers to be elected and to be subject to recall at any time." When Trotsky arrived in Petrograd (May 17 (4) 1917), he said to Kamenev "Nothing separated me from Lenin's famous 'April Theses.'" (*My Life,* II, 53). But in 1918, after Trotsky acquired appointive power, he substituted a totally different thesis: "A real army cannot be run by elected officers who may be dismissed at any moment by their subordinates." (I, R. 16). The word "real" concealed Trotsky's *real* thought that a *burocratic* regime cannot lean on democratically-elected officers who are responsible to their electorate. Trotsky knew that in an appointive, as in an elective system, officers may be dismissed at any moment. With him it was a question of who possessed the power of dismissal, the masses to whom this function rightly belonged, or the burocratic leaders.

The Sovnarkom deceptively named its army "Worker-Peasant Red Army" which sounded more intimate to the masses than "Revolutionary Army." That it was a military tool of the Sovnarkom is unmistakable: "The Supreme Commanding organ of the Worker-Peasant Army is the Soviet of People's Commissars." (Decree of January 28, 1918)

The system of a burocratic officer caste appointed directly by the Cabinet regime was substituted for the original predominantly elective system. The essential political part of the "Oath of the Red Soldier" read: "I bind myself to observe strictest revolutionary discipline and to carry out the orders of the commanders appointed by the authority of the Workers' and Peasants' Government." (*Documents,* 119; *Collec-*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tion of Decrees, 1918, No. 33, 442). "Revolutionary discipline" was in this case the burocratic discipline of the Sovnarkom. Trotsky later described this Army, which served the interests of the Sovnarkom burocracy, in "working class" terms: "The Red Army was an institution built from the top on the principle of the dictatorship of the working class, with officers selected and controlled by the Soviet Government and the Communist Party." (I, R. 16)

2. *The Burocratic Elimination of the Red Guards*

At first the Sovnarkom masked its policy of creating a regular standing army modelled after the army of the exploiting classes by pretending it would build it on a voluntary basis. "In the beginning we could not resort to conscription. We had neither political nor other machinery for drafting the recently demobilized peasants. We called for volunteers..." (14). To the array of facts exposing the Sovnarkom's lie about the utter worthlessness of the peasant-soldiers of the October Army Trotsky adds the inadvertent admission that the Sovnarkom asked the *same* peasants it had demobilized a few weeks earlier to become soldiers once more—but in a *different army.* The trick of calling for volunteers conveyed the impression that Lenin and Trotsky were embarking upon the fulfillment of their 1917 blueprints for building an all-peoples militia, democratic, voluntary, and elective. This trick facilitated the destruction not only of the Army which held together only on the basis of devotion to the ideal of Socialism but it enabled the Sovnarkom to begin eliminating the workers Red Guards, the first proletarian militia, and to transfer their members into the early Red Army.

The Red Guards had been formed before the October Revolution. They were organized not along territorial lines as is a standing army or a bourgeois parliament but on the industrial unit principle like the Soviets. The by-laws of the Red Guards, published on October 23, (Nov. 5,) 1917 by The Buro of the Central Commandature of the Workers Red Guard of Petrograd stated: "The Workers Red Guard is organized along the line of industrial enterprises." (point 19). The Red Guard was a thoroughly democratic institution: "The entire commanding staff (unit heads, commanders of battalions, etc.) are elective." (point 23). (Cited in *Proletarskaya Revolutsia,* No. 4, 1922, 150). Military duty was not compulsory in the Red Guards. They needed no threats of arrest to maintain blind obedience because their discipline was "based not on the strength of blind obedience but on the consciousness of the extraordinary importance of the tasks of the working class." (Point 2). When General Kornilov threatened Petrograd, "The Schlisselburg Red Guard, without a summons and without compulsion, on its own initiative, hastened to the aid of the Petrograd Red Guard." (*Ib.* 152) The Red Guard had closer contact with industry than either the October Army or the Red Army. "Having arisen in the mills and factories, the divisions of the Red Guard were

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

not losing ties with production." (*Kalendar Kommunista na 1924*, 437). Records establish that it was the Red Guards who psychologically and often militarily led the soldiers and smashed the veteran forces of Krasnov, Kornilov, Dutov and Kaledin. (*Ib.* 437-441)

The Sovnarkom moved by stages to eliminate the Red Guards and create in their place and in the place of the October Army a force modelled after bourgeois militarism. First Krylenko in his appeal of January 11, 1918, gave the impression that the new Army was to be a sort of enlarged Red Guard: "The beginnings of such an army were represented by the workers Red Guard." During the Hoffmann raid the Sovnarkom did its utmost to discredit the Red Guards. This historic armed body of the revolutionary vanguard was soon to pass from the stage. "The advance of the Germans on Petrograd marks the end of the Red Guard period." (*Kalendar,* 441). By the middle of May 1918 many Red Guards volunteered for the growing Red Army. On May 29, 1918 Lenin and Trotsky decreed compulsory service. To give a "Soviet" flavor to the new law, which was never discussed by the Bolshevik membership or by the Soviets, it was issued in the name of the Central Executive Committee of Soviets: "The All-Russian Central Executive Committee of Soviets finds that present conditions in the country necessitate our changing from voluntary enlistment in the Army to a general conscription of workers and peasants . . ." (*Collection of Statutes and Decrees,* R. No. 41, 1918, 499)

The introduction of conscription in Sovnarkom territory untied the hands of the White Guard generals who had also relied in the first months after the October Revolution on volunteers. They were now able to introduce conscription too, and also draw upon the mass of soldiers demobilized by Lenin.

The best fighters in the Red Army were not the conscripted soldiers but the volunteer former Red Guards. "The experience of the Civil War demonstrated that the volunteer units fought magnificently, and the more volunteers in the unit the stronger it was." (*Kalendar,* 442). Nor were Lenin and Trotsky successful, in the first years of the existence of the Red Army, in blotting out the elective principle from the memory of the former soldiers of the October Army and the Red Guards. In some sectors of the Civil War Front the principle was practiced in a limited way as late as the Spring of 1919. "The elective principle still exists here and there." (Report of Inspector of Artillery of the Front Armies, Lappo. Cited by Antonov-Ovseenko, April 6, 1919, *Notes on the Civil War,* IV, 126)

3. *The Upper Crust of the Sovnarkom's Army*

Presiding over an assembly of former Tsarist officers, Allied military advisers and a number of Party burocrats who acted as his assistants, Trotsky proceeded with the organization of the Red Army. "Was I prepared to do military work? Of course not." (*My Life,* II, 72). A supreme Council of War was created on March 4, 1918 (*Stalin,* 276),

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

one day after the signing of the Brest Treaty. Despite lack of military science, Trotsky owed his appointment as War Commissar and Chairman of the Supreme Council of War solely to the fact that he was a top-ranking Party burocrat. To fit out in a hurry a military-burocratic apparatus, the leaders of the Party had no other recourse but to enlist the former Tsarist officer caste. This most reactionary element in Russian society was ideally qualified for a burocratic role, adapted to that end by its training and habit. There was one dangerous feature rooted within this element, and that was its *class* outlook. The Lenin-Trotsky regime attempted to eliminate the officers' hatred for the new economic and political system by meticulous attention to their material needs and by reinstating them in their accustomed position of command over the soldiers. "The old officer corps and the power of the Tsarist generals is being restored." wrote the Left Communists in the Spring of 1918. (Quoted in Lenin's *S.W.* VIII, 457)

By a series of determined moves, though meeting widespread opposition and discontent among the Party and Red Army ranks, Trotsky was able to put together a unique burocratic military pyramid. At its apex stood the Bolshevik leaders, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Sverdlov—men utterly unfamiliar with military science—exercising dictatorial authority of appointment, dismissal and control. They were assisted by a supporting staff of personally selected Party burocrats. "I chose Sklyansky as my deputy." (*My Life,* II, 83). Below were successive tiers of Tsarist officers—generals, colonels, majors, captains—nearly all in command of armies, divisions, regiments and lesser units, and in charge of the quartermaster corps. Directly under this strategic layer, occupying a very limited space in the officer element, were the "Red" commanders, drawn primarily from the Bolshevik Party: "In 1918, 76 per cent of the whole command and administration of the Red Army was composed of former officers of the Tsarist Army and only 12.8 per cent consisted of fledgling Red Commanders, who naturally occupied the lower positions." (*Stalin,* 279)

Underneath this pyramid was the soldier mass, robbed of its basic electoral rights by the usurping Russian-nationalist Bolshevik regime, deprived of the privilege of recall for which Lenin and Trotsky had agitated before October, and rendered utterly inarticulate in matters of military policy.

Among the Tsarist officers recruited by Trotsky there was not a single opponent of the burocratic military system, not one in favor of the principle of democratic people's militia advocated by Lenin before the birth of the Sovnarkom. A few of them were "idealists" vowing adherence to the cause of the proletariat; a large group, especially in the higher ranks, was composed of inveterate White Guardists who entered the Red Army for the purposes of sabotage, awaiting a suitable moment to go over openly to Denikin and Kolchak; the widest stratum consisted of run of the mill Tsarist officers who were lacking in initiative, were talentless, inert, routine men "who did not possess

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

enough energy to go over to the Whites." (I, R. 17; *Stalin,* 279). Many of the Tsarist officers recruited by the Lenin-Trotsky regime had been frustrated careerists and adventurers under the bourgeoisie. A case in point was Muraviev to whom Lenin entrusted the Volga Front. A former colonel in the Tsar's Army, he later joined the Left SRs. "Muraviev carried out his careening to the Left not on a basis of a principled political nature but because of his being in disgrace under Kerensky." (Trotsky, III, Pt 2, 396). At the Eighth Congress of the Party, in March 1919, Smirnov showed that the best technical element of the Tsarist officer caste went to the Whites. "With us remained the worst elements."

A little over a year after Trotsky had begun constructing the military-burocratic pyramid, Lenin in a speech on March 13, 1919 made a very illuminating disclosure. The most dangerous type of Tsarist officer, with a known record as hangman and butcher of the workers and peasants, was being enlisted in the Red Army: "You probably are familiar with the disputes caused by this issue, and how often the comrades among the most loyal and confirmed Bolshevik-Communists ardently protested against the fact that in the construction of the Red Socialist Army we are utilizing the old military specialists, Tsarist generals and officers tainted with service to Tsarism and at times with bloody repressions against the workers and peasants." (XVI, R. 71)

One should not be astounded to learn this. In picking up the fragments of the Tsarist burocratic apparatus, the Sovnarkom enrolled a great variety of criminals, enemies of the workers. To give another instance, for a while it retained the old prison staff in Petrograd, introducing only one new feature, appointed Commissars. (Koslovsky, *Proletarskaya Revolutsia,* Oct. 1922, X, 67)

A pertinent case to show the limits to which Lenin and Trotsky went in their indulgence towards the bloody butchers of the workers is that of General Slaschev, known as Slashev the Hangman. Slaschev won his appellation not during the Tsar's regime but during the Civil War. One of the former Stalin burocrats recorded: "At Djankay he won considerable notoriety by hanging all the members of an organization of young Communists—workmen, students, boys and girls, alike. After that he was known all over Russia as Slaschev the Hangman..." (A. Barmin, *Memoirs of a Soviet Diplomat,* 169). When this vicious and ruthless enemy of the proletariat perceived that the White Guard cause was defeated, he hastened to declare a change of heart. Prior to his entry into Sovnarkom territory he and the Bolshevik diplomats held private talks. He probably was given concrete proof that even the worst White Guard murderers of the workers were in no danger of retribution. Having arrived in Bolshevik Russia he printed an appeal to other White Guard generals to enter the service of Lenin and Trotsky: "You are being frightened with stories that the returning Whites are being subjected to repressions. I came, verified, and have

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

become convinced that the past is forgotten." (*Pravda*, Nov. 24, 1921)

Slaschev the Hangman was given a responsible job as an instructor in a military school. But if Lenin and Trotsky did not place him on trial for his ghastly crimes, justice acted from below. "Slaschev was killed by the brother of one of his victims." (Barmin, 169)

In the March 13, 1919 speech Lenin reassured his audience that he and Trotsky were making use of the enemy to build Communism: "When Comrade Trotsky recently informed me that in our war department the number of officers runs into several tens of thousands then I got a concrete understanding of the secret of how to make use of our enemy, how to force those people to build Communism who were its foes, to build Communism out of the bricks gathered by the capitalists for use against us." (XVI, R. 73)

The Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army, contrary to popular misconception, was not War Commissar Trotsky, but first Vatzetis (1918-1919) and then S.S. Kamenev, (1919-1924) a descendant of a Tsarist aristocratic family, often confused by the uninformed with L.B. Kamenev, Bolshevik leader, since 1917 a perennial political partner of Zinoviev. However, Vatzetis and S.S. Kamenev were kept in the shadows and therefore unknown to the wide masses. An atmosphere of glory was created around a Bolshevik name in connection with the Red Army "The beloved leader of the Red Army, Comrade Trotsky." (E. Yaroslavsky, *The Communist International*, No. 25, 46). This atmosphere for a while prevailed even after Trotsky had been accused of "Trotskyism." On June 17, 1924 Kolarov opened the Fifth Congress "I hereby declare the Fifth World Congress of the Communist International open. (Stormy applause). (The International is sung. At this juncture Comrade Trotsky appeared on the Tribune, and was greeted by a stormy ovation from all sides. A voice: 'Long Live the Red Army! Hurrah!' " (*Inprecorr*. June 27, 1924, 377)

In 1918 Trotsky did not hesitate to condemn the *great chief* cult in the bourgeois Army: "The Germans succeeded in creating among their soldiers the Kaiser cult. But we should strive to create the spirit and the readiness to fight for the freedom of the working class." (Speech of the Fourth Trade-Union Conference, June 29, 1918). What the Bolsheviks really created in the Red Army, however, was the Trotsky cult, which later was replaced by the Stalin worship.

Another aspect of "the beloved leader of the Red Army" cult was pontific airs Trotsky gave himself on special occasions. He appropriated the ancient custom of the pompous generals who thanked their troops upon achievement of victory. On September 10, 1918, when Kazan had been wrested from the bourgeois forces, Trotsky addressed the workers and peasants of the Red Army: "In the name of the Soviet of People's Commissars, I say: Comrades, I thank you."

Naturally back in the October 1917 days Trotsky was far from such an arrogant burocratic pose, and never expressed thanks to the revolutionary workers and sailors for occupying the Winter Palace. If

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

he had, they would have certainly concluded that the man suddenly had gone out of his mind.

4. *The Political Commissars in the Red Army*

From the moment Lenin cast overboard his revolutionary blueprint his words began conflicting with his deeds. As we have shown, on March 13, 1919 Lenin stated that he and Trotsky were enlisting "several tens of thousands "of the landlord and bourgeois officers. That very week the Eighth Congress adopted a new Leninist Program which contained the following declaration: "The Red Army, as an instrument of proletarian dictatorship, must of necessity have an open class character, i.e. it must be formed exclusively from the proletariat and semi-proletarian peasantry standing close to the proletariat." The presence of the immense layer of landlord and bourgeois elements and the continuous enlistment of these elements after the adoption of the Program, gave the lie to this paper declaration. A flagrant piece of sophistry was introduced with the aim of putting an end to the lingering sentiment for the principle of elections of the officers so widely practiced in the October Army and the Red Guard. This principle, enunciated in Lenin's April Thesis, stressed in the Bolshevik agitation before October, and reiterated in the Sovnarkom decree of December 29 (16) 1917, before the Army was branded as the Tsar's Army, was now given a twist to mean it had been intended for the *bourgeois* Army. To their Army, the Bolshevik burocrats stated, this elective principle did not apply: "The demand for an electoral commanding structure which had a tremendous principled significance with respect to the bourgeois army where the commanding structure was gathered and trained as an apparatus of class subjugation of the soldiers and through them of the toiling masses, is losing completely its principled significance with regard to the class workers and peasants Red Army." (Lenin, *Col. Wks.* XVI, R. 480)

Running counter to revolutionary-democratic principles, the burocratic leaders found themselves ensnarled in a myriad of monstrous contradictions. In the bourgeois army the officer element is supremely loyal to the capitalist class. The early Red Army was an anomaly involving various incongruous elements each with a different goal. Its mass base was influenced by the lofty idea of liberating all humanity from capitalist and landlord exploitation in every country on earth. The commanding stratum which was landlord and bourgeois had its head and heart in the camp of its class brethren, the White Guards. Smirnov openly called attention to this fact at the Eighth Congress of the Party in March 1919: "Concerning the composition of the commanding element, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the former officer caste in its bulk is close to the White Guards." (*Sten. Rep.* 133). The ex-Tsarist officers, with some exceptions, wanted to see the Red Army destroyed, the Bolshevik upstarts hanged and wished for a military dictatorship of their own kind with or without a Romanov

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

on the throne of a reborn Russian Empire. Not a few of these officers, risking death, worked inside the Red Army to bring about the victory of the White forces. Their failure was not due to lack of zeal or devotion to the White cause. Many of them actually paid with their lives. But they met with two insurmountable obstacles: one, the iron determination on the part of Lenin and Trotsky to maintain themselves in power and thus to preserve the Bolshevik State; and second, the astonishing tenacity and invincibility of spirit of the proletarian vanguard.

Since Lenin and Trotsky had gone through an extraordinary political training, they knew well that the Tsarist military specialist was the most dangerous of all their hidden enemies. However, since he was the only available material for their burocratic military structure, they set up strict supervision against the inevitable sabotage and disruption. In his speech at the Moscow Soviet on March 19, 1918 Trotsky, apropos of the concealed counter-revolution within the Red Army, declared: "After all, in relation to the Army, too, the whole power will remain entirely in the hands of the Soviets, who shall appoint (!!!—G.S.) in all military organs and military sections reliable political commissars to exercise general control. The importance of these commissars must be raised to enormous heights; their power will be unlimited." (Cited in *Fourth Int.* October 1941, 244)

However, the institution of commissars soon proved to be a miserable failure, and Trotsky was impelled to make a veiled acknowledgement of that fact: "We cannot say that the institution of commissars is a guarantee against individual treason and flights to the side of the enemy." (II, R. 76). The crux of the matter was that in the military field, infinitely more so than in the industrial, the hand of an adroit saboteur could easily escape detection. Disruption could range all the way from wasteful expenditure of munitions and material to the butchery of great masses of soldiers by throwing them against solid positions. Through schemes adopted after a "scientific" discussion of military plans with the Bolshevik rulers themselves, "plans" which seemed efficient and practical, whole divisions were diverted from the path of the White Armies. The daily work of inconspicuous character which could not be readily defined as sabotage tended to elude a Bolshevik commissar though he might have some knowledge of military science. In April 1918, only a short while after Trotsky had begun placing the Tsarist officers in posts, the Left Communists gave a fairly accurate estimate of the work of those military specialists: "The more competent one of them is in the military field the more dangerous he is in the task of defending the Revolution. The general scheme of their work is as follows: they issue such orders which should lead to a sure failure. For those who understand nothing about strategic and tactical tasks it is absolutely impossible to catch the treacherous essence of the orders. Naturally such people thus far are few, but they, more than everybody else, are familiar with military science, and this is everything. From

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

this point of view, the appointment of commanders from among the old officers is extraordinarily risky and dangerous. No political control can help here, because those who exercise control must possess the true knowledge of military science." (Stukov, *Kommunist,* April 27, 1918)

Although at the outset Trotsky had said that the political commissars would be given unlimited power, he found this idea inexpedient for the Sovnarkom's purposes. He was impelled by the very essence of the burocratic requirements of installing the officer caste in commanding heights to assure it a position of stability and a wide scope of dominance in the military sphere. Otherwise no appointive apparatus of coersion out of the Tsarist officer caste could be created.

Trotsky used a two-fold method in breaking the deep-rooted class sentiment of the Tsarist officer caste. With those caught red-handed in the act of aiding the Whites Trotsky did not stand on ceremony. He had them shot. With the others, many of them not entirely innocent of secret machinations against the new masters, Trotsky employed a big-hearted approach. He carried out to the fullest in the Red Army the method of corruption which Lenin introduced in bribing industrial specialists and in establishing individual dictators. He appealed to the vanity of the old reactionary caste, to its ingrained careerism, its craving for privileges and favoritism as against the soldiers. "The commanding element is accorded a number of privileges in the form of special conditions. Although there prevails the general barrack situation, the arrested officers enjoy the right of individual apartments and under certain conditions the right to have orderlies." (Smirnov, *S.R.* Eighth Congress of the R.C.P. 135)

If there were a few honest revolutionary-minded officers who would have sided with the toilers under a democratic proletarian regime, they invariably became contaminated and were turned into obedient servitors of the supreme burocratic authorities.

Trotsky's policy of making the Tsarist officer feel at home of necessity curbed the power of the political commissars. They were acting as automatons, rubber-stamping the orders of the Tsarist officers as a matter of routine, never knowing definitely the military essence of the order and only on the basis of results surmising its political nature. "According to the rules, the signature of the commissar or political member of the Council of War on an operative order meant merely that the order did not have any hidden counter-revolutionary significance. As for the operative meaning of the order, that was entirely the responsibility of the commander." (*Stalin,* 296). The operative validity of a commander's order was tested by soldiers' lives.

Individual members of the Bolshevik Party were enjoined from criticising the operative orders of the ex-Tsarist officers in Command or questioning their commanders' integrity and loyalty. In January 1919, in line with allowing ever-greater latitude to the Tsarist officers and further limiting the rights of the Bolshevik Party members, Lenin

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and Trotsky clamped the gag rule on the Party units in the Red Army: "Party units must not interfere in the actions and orders of the commanding staff." Two months after the issuance of this order, Smirnov at the Eighth Congress spoke of the limitations placed on the rights of the political commissars in the matter of operations in the field: "The political commissar has the right only in special circumstances to rescind the decision of the Commander of an army or a front. In each such instance the political commissar must inform the higher department. And in the questions of operations they do not have even that right." (*Sten. Rep.* 135)

During the October 1917 period the Russian workers got along very well without the hired Tsarist generals whom Lenin and Trotsky later euphemistically called "military specialists." Just as the Spanish workers in July 1936 virtually with bare hands smashed the seasoned military machine of the Fascist generals in almost every important center of Spain, so the Russian workers' militia and a few detachments of the October Army defeated Kerensky and the very officer caste a huge portion of which Trotsky subsequently installed in command of the Sovnarkom's military machine.

The Lenin-Trotsky policy of curbing the revolutionary workers, of bribing the specialists and of establishing them as individual dictators over the soldiers could not but revive hope among these anti-working class elements for a White Guard victory. Their interpretation could only be that Lenin had lost faith in the workers. And while the industrial saboteurs succeeded in disorganizing and reducing production, the military specialists constantly aided the White Guard armies to secure victories: "Treason had nests among the staff and the commanding officers; in fact, everywhere. The enemy knew where to strike and almost always did so with certainty. It was discouraging." Trotsky later recorded in his autobiography. "Not a month passes without a treacherous act on the part of a military specialist," Lenin admitted in *Izvestia* on November 19, 1919.

Trotsky and Lenin always made it seem that the integration of the counter-revolutionary, utterly burocratic Tsarist officer caste into the Red Army was of military value to the toiling masses. Yet just as in the Spanish Civil War, the commanders of the White Guard forces were receiving highly valuable information from their confederates in the high circles of the Red Army. But things had been quite the opposite in the days of the October Army. The same enemy had been in the dark as to when, where and how to strike at the toiling masses. It was in no position to strike. It was dispersed, totally excluded from the proletarian Red Guard and effectively crushed in the Army. There stands the glaring contrast. On the one side before the Brest "peace" a rapid, virtually bloodless, epic march of the masses free from the grip of Tsarist generals; on the other side, during and following the "breathing spell," the masses, supposedly reinforced by tens of thousands of professional military men, suffer a protracted bloodletting,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with the Red Army's goal periodically retarded by sabotage, costly setbacks and ghastly massacres engineered by the "military specialists."

It is of course impossible to compute or even approximately determine the number of sporadic uprisings and acts of disruption effected by the military specialists. A few outstanding ones are worth mentioning. On May 16, 1918 a large number of officers and soldiers rebelled at Saratov. In July (6-21) 1918 a very serious uprising occurred in Yaroslavl: "Officers employed as specialists in the Yaroslavl Soviet institutions and army units, basing themselves on the bourgeois section of the population, suddenly seized the central portion of the city and carried out a mass butchery of Communists and workers, and fortified themselves. The city was encircled with a ring of Red troops and after battles lasting two weeks was cleared of the White Guardists." (Lenin, XV, R. "Notes" 674). The uprising was no chance move but a part of an organized plan with threads connecting the secret White Guards in the Red Army with the open White Guards, with the Czechoslovak generals and with the Allied imperialists. "The Yaroslavl mutiny together with the unsuccessful mutinies in other cities situated on the upper Volga (Rybinsk, Murom, etc.) was organized with the view to the establishment of a unifying link connecting the Northern and Czechoslovak Eastern fronts and to base the Czechoslovaks on Archangel." (*Ib.* 675)

During the organization of this enterprise involving a network of cities and thousands of participants, the political commissars, and even the stern Cheka which was watching the specialists, were unable to perceive beforehand any suspicious activity to indicate the existence of a counter-revolutionary military plot. How then could the political commissar, even if he had a practiced military eye, distinguish counter-revolutionary meaning in an order of a Red Army Tsarist general shifting forces here and there under the pretext of protecting a flank or reinforcing some other position!

In the Autumn of 1918 some military specialists of the Red Army deserted and took with them an entire division (the 11th) to the side of the White forces. Some regiments deserted on the Perm front. Lesser desertions were numerous. Petrograd lived through some trying hours in the Spring of 1919 due to the "work" of military specialists: "The Commander of the Seventh Army, stationed on the outskirts of Petrograd, entered into communication with Yudenich and organized a conspiracy among the garrisons surrounding the capital of the October Revolution—Kronstadt, Oranienbaum, Krasnaya Gorka, Syeraya Loshad, Krasnoe Syelo. The conspirators, according to their complot with Yudenich, made ready to occupy the capital simultaneously with the troops of his army. They hoped for the support of the disgruntled sailors and especially the active aid of the Fleet. But the sailors of the two Soviet dreadnaughts did not support the insurrection." (*Stalin,* 306)

The year 1919 brought a veritable epidemic of acts of disruption.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Bolshevik burocrats issued an order in which they resorted to a stratagem of appealing to the patriotic Russian feelings of the White Guard officers in the Red Army: "There have been instances in the Army of base treason of the commanding staff composed of former officers: desertions to the Whites, the opening of the front at Pskov, treason at Krasnaya Gorka. Officers who call themselves *Russians* attempted to sell Petrograd to the Finnish and British capitalists." (Order of the Revolutionary-Military Army Soviet, *Petrogradskaya Pravda,* August 1, 1919. Our emph.—G.S.). In carrying out its work of sabotage the Tsarist military caste was far more loyal to its class than the Revolutionary-Military Army Soviet was to the workers when it set aside the world-proletarian sentiments and, for burocratic considerations, struck the *Russian* nationalist chord, to which incidentally, the secret White Guard officers did not respond at all.

The events touched off by the fall of Kazan revealed the fact that the institution of political commissars in the Red Army, an accessory to the policy of hiring the Tsarist officer caste, was not at all treason-proof. On the Kazan front a commissar working hand in glove with the commanding officer helped to bring about the desertion of a key regiment.

The policy of leaving the direction of military operations to the bribed Tsarist officers met with furious opposition within the ranks of the Party; and during the Kazan situation Lenin himself became alarmed. But Trotsky was adamant. His was the unshakeable conviction, vindicated in the end, that the careerism, ambitions and Russian patriotism of the Tsarist officers could be divorced from the bourgeoisie and harnessed to the burocratic regime of the Bolshevik State. To the assertion that the specialists were saboteurs, Trotsky gave an interesting reply: "When I was at the front near Svyazhsk, Lenin asked my opinion concerning a proposal introduced by one of the prominent Party members to replace all officers of the General Staff with Communists. I replied sharply in the negative. 'True,' I replied by direct wire from Svyazhsk to the Kremlin on the 23rd of August, 1918, 'of the officers, many are traitors. But there is evidence of sabotage during the movement of troops on the railways as well, yet no one proposes to replace railway engineers with Communists.' " (*Stalin,* 277-8)

Having had illuminating experiences with Communist workers who, although lacking in the rudiments of military science, managed to overcome almost insurmountable difficulties on the fronts, Trotsky could have no doubts that there would have been less shifting of trains to wrong destinations, less congestion, less damage to cars and locomotives if the management of the transport system were taken out of the dictatorial hands of the specialists, many of them specialists at sabotage, and turned over to the supervision of the railway workers. As it was, the paralysis on the railways during the Civil War grew, and later, Trotsky, while blaming "actual conditions," made the ad-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

mission that "it is very probable that certain engineers were shaping the transport situation fit into their diagrams." (*My Life*, II, 198)

Because the masses had to be imbued with the belief that the placing of the Tsarist officers at the head of the Red Army was necessary, the number of those specialists who performed overt acts of sabotage was minimized. On the other hand, the burocratic mass of officers staying in the Red Army was portrayed as *honestly* working for the interests of the masses. "*Dozens* of specialists who turned out to be traitors have been thrown out by us from the Red Army. But *thousands* of military specialists honestly performing their duty remain in the ranks of the worker-peasant Red Army." (Lenin, *Pravda*, Sept. 11, 1919; *C.W.* XVI, R. 318, Our emph.—G.S.). How far the "dozens" were from the true number of plotters can be gleaned from the fact that in Yaroslavl alone 350 specialists were executed. (*Pravda*, July 26, 1918)

5. *Lenin's Threat to Arrest Antonov-Ovseenko*

The extent to which the Sovnarkom went in shielding and supporting the Tsarist officers is illustrated by a dramatic episode described by Antonov-Ovseenko. In 1918 the Supreme Commander in Chief of the Red Army was Vatzetis, a General Staff Colonel under the Tsar. Antonov-Ovseenko began to suspect Vatzetis of a deliberate policy of disintegrating the Red Army forces. At the end of November 1918 Antonov came to Moscow to express his misgivings to Lenin: "To Ilyitch's question, What is taking place at Voronezh, I draw a picture of the collapse of our Eighth Army, the confusion and helplessness of its commanding staff, complete disorder in its rear and a virtual panic in Voronezh itself. This spectacle I myself have actually observed. In this situation the Supreme Command is throwing directly into Voronezh untrained, inexperienced, politically raw new units which were assigned to us. Naturally having entered into the chaos and semi-panic of Voronezh these units rapidly decomposed.

" 'What, then, in your opinion should be done?' he asks dryly and harshly.

" 'If these units were turned over to us, including, as we had suggested, two organized regiments of the Ninth Reserve Division, then in a couple of weeks, keeping away from the Voronezh gap, we would have organized a shock force. With this force we would have driven to Kupiansk and from there against Krasnov's flank. Simultaneously, concentrating Ukrainian divisions, border units and a couple of armored trains we would have struck at Kharkov. Yet the Supreme Command is throwing forces headlong, bringing sure decomposition. This is either a panicky stupidity, covered up with military specialism or—I hate to think of it—treason.'

"Ilyich jumped up, I never saw him so irritated.

" 'What! What has happened to discipline! You ought to be arrested! If there is an order, you should obey it. That is the reason for decomposition.'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"'I have obeyed and do obey. But I must report to you my complete opinion. You are the responsible person.'

"'This is the business of the military. Your business is to carry out the order; else, arrest.'" (Antonov-Ovseenko, *Notes,* III, 30)

This threat could not be an isolated episode, and it was not. Another example of Lenin's personal dictator attitude is seen in a telegram sent by him in August 1918: "To Minkin: It is foolish to ask whether the People's Commissariat of Finances, and of one district at that, can cancel my order. If this order is not carried out, I will commit the culprits to the tribunal . . . I demand detailed reports about the fulfilment of all my orders." (*Leninsky Sbornik,* XVIII, 208) And another example: "I am making a stern reprimand with a warning that, if repeated, the culprits will be turned over to the tribunal: Comrades Shpecterev (of the People's Commissariat of War) Voykov (of People's Commissariat of Foreign Trade), Goltsman (of the All-Russian SPS) for having failed to appear at the meeting of the Commission STO on the 23 of April at 10 a.m. of which Commission they had been informed on the 22 of April prior to 10 p.m. personally or by telephone . . ." (*Ib.* XX, 342-3)

And another: "In Gorki, in the park, there were several dead trees. It was decided to cut them down. Vladimir Ilyitch imagined that one of the felled trees was not entirely dead. On account of that tree he created a whole scandal. The culprit was found. Lenin asked him, 'Have you ever grown at least one such a tree?' 'No.' 'And yet there was much toil put in to grow it. Place him under arrest.' In the end it was possible to convince Vladimir Ilyich that he was in error and that the tree had been really dead." (N. Meshcheriakov, "From Reminiscences About Lenin," *Pechat i Revolutsia,* 1924, II, 13)

In the case of Antonov-Ovseenko Lenin was dealing here not with a petty functionary but with an outstanding Party leader, a member of the Bolshevik Central Committee, the man who together with Trotsky and Podvoisky had guided the concrete action in the overthrow of the Kerensky regime. Antonov says he did not persist but walked out of Lenin's office feeling very unpleasant. Unquestionably, had he continued "meddling" Lenin would have placed him under arrest. The arbitrary power of an individual Bolshevik dictator is vividly disclosed in this episode. Hardly three weeks elapsed and Antonov learned that an intrigue was afoot to remove him from his post as Commander of the Ukrainian forces. On December 17, 1918 he was informed by Vatzetis of the projected removal. "The next day, by means of persistent questioning I got from the Supreme Commander information that the Revolutionary War Council of the Republic and also the Government had received resolutions from some sort of meetings of 'activists' in Kharkov and perhaps in Kupiansk on the unacceptibility of Antonov in the capacity of Commander of the Ukrainian Army, and that supposedly these 'activists' had even sent some sort of a delegation. Comrade Marapulets, who was present with me in the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

headquarters of the Revolutionary War Council, confirmed this information. According to Vatzetis, I was charged, besides being unsuccessful in the struggle against the Germans and 'disregard for workers' organizations' with Ukrainian separatism as well." (*Notes*, III, 40-41)

About six months later something mysterious occurred with respect to Vatzetis, a protege of Trotsky's: "I directed my efforts toward making Vatzetis sure of himself, of his rights and his authority. Without this, command is impossible." (*My Life*, II, 185). Early in July 1919 Vatzetis was removed from his high post and arrested a few days later. What happened? Years later Trotsky said: "he was accused of dubious schemes and connections so that he had to be dismissed. But there was nothing serious in these accusations." (127). At the time of the event, however, Trotsky knew that definite evidence had been uncovered proving that Vatzetis knew of a treasonable conspiracy of officers closely associated with him. On July 8, 1919 Lenin, Sklyansky, Krestinsky and Dzerzinsky, the head of the Cheka, sent a coded, "strictly secret" dispatch to Trotsky: "Domozhirov, who has confessed and has been completely proved a traitor, has given factual testimony about a conspiracy in which an active part was played by Isayev, who was for a long time attached on duty to the Commander-in-Chief and lived with him in the same apartment. Many other proofs, a whole lot of evidence, convict the Commander-in-Chief of knowing about the conspiracy. The Commander-in-Chief had to be arrested." (Cited in *Stalin*, 315)

Thus, Antonov's suspicions were well founded. Lenin secretly reported to Trotsky that there was much proof "a whole lot of evidence," establishing that the military head of the Red Army was a virtual accessory to a conspiracy against the Red Army. Vatzetis, according to Trotsky, was "undoubtedly prone to yield to the influence of elements hostile to the Revolution." (310). A lesser figure would probably have been shot at once. Lenin, and particularly Trotsky, undoubtedly feared a scandal and an explosion in the Party against continuing the policy of placing the Tsarist officers in commanding position. Obviously to hush the matter a secret deal was made with Vatzetis. He was released and appointed as a Professor of the War College.

6. *General S.S. Kamenev's Plan*

In the Summer of 1919, just prior to the removal and arrest of the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army, a violent struggle broke out in the top circle of the Sovnarkom burocracy. The issue was the question of strategy; but beneath this issue ran a heavy current of numerous personal intrigues, plots and careerist ambitions. At this point we shall deal primarily with the plan of General S.S. Kamenev.

Kamenev was the Red Army Commander on the Kolchak Front. In June 1919 Kolchak's forces were in full eastward retreat into Siberia, while Denikin was making advances in the Ukraine. "When the Commander-in-Chief, i.e. Vatzetis, agreeing with me in principle, had sug-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

gested that the Eastern Front remain for the Winter in the Urals, in order to transfer several divisions to the South, where the situation was becoming threatening, Kamenev, supported by Smilga and Lashevich, had offered very resolute resistance." (*Stalin,* 313). General S.S. Kamenev's contention was that while several divisions could be removed from his front, there was no need to stop the offensive against Kolchak. "Stalin pounced upon the conflict between the Eastern Front and the Commander-in-Chief. He treated Vatzetis, who had officially condemned his intervention in strategic matters, with hostility and lay in wait for an opportunity to wreak vengeance upon him. Now such an opportunity presented itself. Smilga, Lashevich and Gussev proposed, obviously with the cooperation of Stalin, to appoint Kamenev Commander-in-Chief. The success on the Eastern Front bribed Lenin and broke down my resistance." (*Ib.*)

On July 3, 1919 Trotsky suffered the first serious political defeat since he had joined the Bolshevik Party. Lenin reorganized the Revolutionary Council of War, with Gusev, Smilga, Rykov and the new Supreme Commander-in-Chief, the former Tsarist, S.S. Kamenev, forming a majority against Trotsky and his deputy Sklyansky. Trotsky decided on a "brilliant" diplomatic stroke. He resigned from the Chairmanship of the Revolutionary Council of War, from the post of Commissar of War and from the membership in the Politburo. The move produced the calculated effect. Lenin, Stalin and others in the Central Committee realized that to allow the resignation to stand would be to create a furor in the Party and in the Army. They bowed to his ego and declined his resignation. The most conciliatory feature in their statement of July 5, 1919 read: "The Organizational and Political Bureaux of the Central Committee offer Comrade Trotsky full opportunity to strive by any means for what he considers an improvement of the policy in the military question, and, if he so desires, will try to expedite the convocation of the Party Congress." (Cited in *Stalin,* 315). Trotsky was satisfied. "I withdrew my resignation and immediately went to the Southern Front." (*Ib.*)

The new Commander-in-Chief continued the offensive against the rapidly decomposing forces of Kolchak, and thereby won Lenin's complete confidence. However the crux of the whole situation was no longer Kolchak but Denikin, and the fate of the Bolshevik State hinged now on the strategy on the Southern Front. The new Commander-in-Chief introduced an extremely queer plan. He decided to let Denikin's Volunteer Army advance unhindered toward Moscow; meanwhile the Red Army would strike far to the south-east at Kuban, Denikin's solid Cossack base. The plan was either stupidity and ignorance or a clever trap for Lenin.

Lenin's failure to realize that the Red Army would be confronting a hostile population in the Cossack territory of Don and Kuban while the Ukrainian proletariat and peasantry would be left to the mercy of Denikin's "volunteers" can be explained only by his excessive trust

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in General S.S. Kamenev. Denikin bothered very little about protecting his Cossack base and opened his march toward Moscow while the Red Army started its ill-fated offensive into the steppes of the Don and Kuban. "The Cossacks formed a formidable bulwark in Denikin's rear. They were rooted in their land, held it with their teeth and claws. Our offensive put the whole Cossack population on their feet. We were wasting our time and energy and managing only to push all those capable of bearing arms directly into the White army. In the meantime, Denikin swept the Ukraine, filled his ranks, advanced toward the north, took Kursk, took Oryol, and was threatening Tula. The surrender of Tula would have been a catastrophe, because it would have involved the loss of the rifle and cartridge manufacturing plants." (*My Life,* II, 188)

Trotsky asserts that he was opposed to S.S. Kamenev's plan from the outset but that Stalin was for it. (*Stalin School* 222). That Trotsky expressed his opposition on September 6, 1919, two months after the plan had been advanced and caused one catastrophe after another is clear from the documentary evidence he adduces (223; *Stalin,* 319). That Stalin too was opposed to S.S. Kamenev's plan, also in September, is obvious. (Stalin to Lenin, *Life of Stalin a Symposium,* 71-73). However, in *July* when S.S. Kamenev's plan was put in operation, Trotsky, *knowing* that the plan would spell disaster if carried out, vigorously supported it. Was it burocratic discipline? Desire to avoid further friction with Lenin? Or was it the cold calculation to allow the plan to expose itself through a concrete demonstration of its destructiveness and thereby to impress Lenin as he had impressed the Russian masses with the Hoffmann advance? Those who expressed doubt about the plan were harshly dealt with by Trotsky. On July 29, 1919 in a message to the Central Committee Trotsky said: "While in Kozlov, I removed the Chief of Operations, Peremytov, who expressed disagreement with the plan of the Commander-in-Chief and replaced him with Berenda, whom I hastily summoned from the Military Inspection. Before I left, by agreement with Sokolnikov and in his presence, I bluntly confronted Yegoryev with the issue of unconditional execution of the Commander-in-Chief's plan. He replied with the utmost categoricalness and as far as I could judge without any mental reservations." (Cited in *Stalin,* 317)

When Denikin entered Orel on October 13, 1919 Trotsky decided to put pressure on Lenin: "I confronted the Politburo with the alternatives: either to change our strategy or evacuate Tula, destroying the war industries there, and resist the direct threat to Moscow. By that time the stubbornness of the Commander-in-Chief, who was himself already discarding parts of the old plan, and the support of the Politburo were broken." (320-1)

Trotsky, after a brief loss of prestige, reestablished his reputation as a master of military strategy among his personal worshippers. Later Stalin claimed the credit for having discarded the S.S. Kamenev plan,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

but the falseness of this claim has been exposed by the Trotsky supporters (Markin, "Stalin and the Red Army," Appendix to Trotsky's *The Stalin School* 223-6). But the men who opposed the plan not merely orally, as Trotsky claims he had in the beginning, but by a determined refusal to carry it out, and who were punished by Trotsky for not submitting blindly to military authority, stand damned by both the Trotsky and the Stalin schools of falsifiers of history.

It was only Lenin in the last analysis who enjoyed the prerogative of accepting or rejecting the plans of the Supreme Commander. In S.S. Kamenev's plan was included an eventual offensive against Denikin. When no offensive was undertaken Lenin grew alarmed and empowered Sklyansky to prod S.S. Kamenev:

"The delay of the offensive in the direction of Voronezh (from the first of August to the tenth!) is monstrous. Denikin's success is tremendous. What's the matter? Sokolnikov said that there our forces were four times as large as theirs. What then is the matter? How could we have missed the opportunity so badly? Tell the Commander-in-Chief that things cannot go on like that. He must pay *serious* attention. Hadn't we better send this sort of telegram to the Revolutionary Council of War of the Southern Front (copy to Smilga) in code: Utterly inadmissible to delay attack because such delay gives all of Ukraine to Denikin and destroys us. You are responsible for every extra day and even hour of delaying the offensive. Communicate immediately your explanations and when at last you will begin a resolute offensive." (Cited in *Stalin,* 318)

After taking Orel Denikin continued his sweep north and on the 17 of October captured Novosil in Tula province. By then Lenin had discarded the S.S. Kamenev plan. The Red Army struck directly at Denikin. Orel was recaptured on the 19 of October. In several short weeks Denikin's Army was broken and its remnants were rapidly driven back toward the Black Sea.

Because of the unquestioned strait-jacket subservience to former Tsarist generals which the handful of top burocrats imposed on the masses, on the Red Army, on the Soviets and even on the upper stratum of the Bolshevik leadership, the S.S. Kamenev plan came within an ace of being "successful." Shielded by Lenin's credo of *obey blindly or arrest,* his arbitrary support to the plan served to prolong the Civil War and cost the deceived masses tens of thousands of lives. "We wasted several months, suffered many needless losses and lived through some very menacing weeks." (*My Life,* II, 188)

Though the history of the Red Army is replete with cases of the dismissal of officers for minor offenses or no offenses at all, General S.S. Kamenev was retained in his post until it was abolished in April 1924. His plan passed into the Bolshevik history as an "error" (*Stalin,* 314, 320), "obstinacy" and "factionalism of the most stupid and most dangerous kind to the Republic" (*Life of Stalin,* 71). What it really represented was known only to the author of the plan, to the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

people whom he took into his confidence, and was probably suspected by those who were willing to suffer persecution at Trotsky's hands rather than carry out what they clearly perceived to be criminally wrong.

The Bolshevik burocracy won in the Civil War. Its victory was due, on the one hand, to the unspeakable atrocities of the White Guard generals, and, on the other hand, to the passionate "revolutionary" appeals which deceived the proletarian vanguard into believing it was fighting and dying for Socialism. However, the victory was long in coming because of the disruptive military strategy of Vatzetis and Kamenev and the stifling policy of personal dictatorial rule which facilitated that military strategy. This truth has been well hidden by Stalin and Trotsky; instead, a lie has been spread that both the military strategy and the political line were *correct*. Thus Trotsky declared at the Fourth Congress of the Comintern (Nov. 5—Dec. 3, 1922): "If we were victorious in the Civil War then it was not only and not so much due to the correctness of our war strategy as to our correct political strategy which invariably guided our military operation in the Civil War."

The Bolshevik leaders won a double triumph: they secured a military victory over the Russian bourgeoisie and a political administrative victory over the Russian masses. Lenin's Russian burocratic policy in the Civil War successfully prevented the unfolding of the struggle along the road of world revolution and historically led the Russian masses into a blind alley. As the Bolsheviks themselves wrote: "The Soviet power has come out victorious in the Civil War, but the victory .... has been secured at the price of devastation, of terrible famine, the introduction of the "newest" economic policy, general fatigue and division of the proletarian strength. The former enemies of the Soviet Republic have not laid down their arms. Behind them stands the bourgeois West, they draw strength from famine and all sorts of crises within the country." (*Krasnaya Nov*, March-April, 1922, 258-9)

CHAPTER XII.

THE CANCER OF CAREERISM IN THE SOVNARKOM ARMY

1. *Would-be Napoleons*

THE PROFESSIONAL militarists, whether in the White or in the Bolshevik camp, were bent on making careers for themselves. Vatzetis entertained the vision of becoming a Russian Bonaparte—a vision possible only in a reactionary army: "While other 'specialists' were most fearful of overstepping their authority, Vatzetis, on the contrary, in his moments of inspiration, would issue orders as if the Sovnarkom and the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets did not exist. About a year later, he was accused of dubious schemes and connec-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tions so that he had to be dismissed. But there was nothing serious in the accusations. Perhaps before going to sleep, he had been reading Napoleon's biography, and confined his ambitious dreams to two or three young officers." (*My Life,* II, 127). Trotsky presented the corrupt careerist through the prism of extenuating burocratic understanding. The "chap," a Commander in a supposedly proletarian-revolutionary army was "merely" dreaming of establishing himself as a military dictator! Napoleonic ideas in the commanding summits of the Red Army were a matter of course.

The leaders of the Bolshevik Party, bearing in mind the memory of the French Revolution and conscious of the burocratic rottenness of their regime, kept a vigilant eye on the Tsarist officers, and on one another. A coup by a military burocrat, Tsarist or Bolshevik, was out of question. Trotsky could never have staged an 18th Brumaire, although he wielded more power than Napoleon had in the early period of the Directory. Lenin's power in the Party and the State could only arouse envy in the ambitious burocrat whose central and compelling motive was to be not a puppet but the puppeteer. Third in rank of real power was Stalin. Due to his lack of popularity Stalin could never overthrow Lenin and Trotsky by means of a Bonapartist coup. The Stalin "coup" had to be stretched over many years.

2. *Rumors and Intrigue Involving the Big Three*

In light of the rules of proletarian democracy as enunciated in Lenin's programmatic documents of 1917, the three top men excercised their power illegally. This illegality revealed itself not only in their attitude toward the masses but also in their relations among themselves. Trotsky relates a very significant conversation with a leading Bolshevik: "Having finished the official part of his visit, he began to shuffle about, with that ingratiating smile of his that simultaneously evokes alarm and perplexity. He ended by putting a question: Was I aware that Stalin was conducting a complicated intrigue against me? 'What!' I said in sheer bewilderment. I was so far from any such thoughts or apprehensions. 'Yes, he is telling Lenin and some others that you are grouping men about you specially against Lenin.' 'You must be mad, Menzhinsky. Please wake up. And as for me, I don't want to talk about it.'" (182). Trotsky evidently was deeply perturbed and though he cut off the conversation by declaring he did not want to discuss the allegations, he later did talk about them with Lenin. One would assume Lenin's reaction could be no other than laughter. Not at all!

"Lenin was usually gay. Nor do I consider myself a gloomy person. In the end I told him about Menzhinsky's visit at the Southern front and asked, 'Is it possible that there is any truth in it?' I noticed that Lenin became excited. Even the blood rushed to his face. 'All trifles,' he kept repeating, although not in a very convincing way. 'I am interested in only one thing,' I said. 'Could you entertain even for a

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

moment such a horrible thought as that I was picking people to oppose you?' 'Trifles,' replied Lenin; but this time with a firmness that I was instantly reassured. As though a little cloud over us seemed to melt away, and our parting was very friendly. But I realized that Menzhinsky was not merely babbling. If Lenin denied it without telling me everything, it was only because he feared a conflict, a quarrel, a personal fight." (183)

These were no vague generalities Lenin and Trotsky talked about. What facts, if any, did Lenin withhold from Trotsky? Why didn't he tell "everything"? Why would there have been a "personal quarrel" had he revealed all he knew?

3. *Military Dictators*

In June 1918 Lenin sent Stalin to the North Caucasus. By then the Bolshevik lines south of Tsaritsin (later Stalingrad) were already menaced by Cossack detachments of the White Army. Lenin invested Stalin with *unlimited* powers: "Stalin arrived at Tsaritsyn in June, 1918, with a detachment of Red Guards, with two armored trains and with *unlimited powers,* in order to arrange for provisioning the hungry political and industrial centers with grain." (*Stalin,* 285, Our emph.—G.S.). The decree raising Stalin to the status of a powerful personal dictator reads:

"31 of May, 1918. Member of the People's Commissars Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin is appointed by the Soviet of People's Commissars as the general supervisor of the problem of supply in the South of Russia, with extraordinary rights. The local and regional Sovnarkoms, Sovdeps, Revkoms, staffs and commanders of military detachments, railroad organizations and station masters, the organizations of the merchant fleet, river and marine, post office and telegraph and supply organizations, all commissars and emissars are obligated to carry out the orders of Comrade Stalin.

Chairman of the Soviet of People's
Commissars V. Ulianov, (Lenin)
Director of the Soviet Affairs
Vlad. Bonch Bruevich."

(*Documents of the Heroic Defense of Tsaritsin, R.* 42; *Documents on the History of the Civil War in SSSR; Len. Sb.* XVIII, 193)

To Stalin this decree came as no surprise whatsoever. Two days earlier he had telephoned to the Tsaritsin Bolshevik leaders: "I have been appointed general director of all supply work of the whole south of Russia and have been granted unlimited power by the Sovnarkom. My orders must be obeyed without any exceptions by all organizations, railway, post and telegraph, military, political, supply and the merchant marine." (May 29, 1918, *Documents,* 152)

Fearing that the Volga and Caspian sailors might resent his per-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sonal dictatorship, Stalin on June 5, 1918 sent a telegram to Lenin from Griazi: "Issue a special order to the organizations of the merchant fleet on the Volga and Caspian stating that they must carry out my orders indisputably." (155). Lenin responded at once with a stern order to the sailors' organizations: "You are to carry out immediately and incontrovertibly all orders and instructions of the special supreme emissary of the Sovnarkom, the People's Commissar, Stalin." (*Len. Sb.* XVIII, 194)

Stalin's extensive power as military dictator in 1918 was expressly formulated by no other person than Trotsky: "Stalin's assumption of the functions of manager of all the military forces at the front had obtained the confirmation of Moscow. The telegram of the Revolutionary Council of War of the Republic, which bore the notation that it was sent by agreement with Lenin, expressly delegated Stalin 'to establish order, unite all detachments into regular formations, establish proper command, after expelling all insubordinates.' Thus the rights given to Stalin were signed, as far as one is able to judge from the text, were even formulated by me." (*Stalin,* 287)

Trotsky had become a military dictator much earlier, and on a far wider scale, when he assumed the post of War Commissar (March 1918): "During the war, in my hands would be concentrated almost unlimited power. The revolutionary tribunal held its sessions in my train, the fronts were subordinate to me, the rear to the fronts. And at times nearly the entire territory of the Republic, not occupied by the Whites, consisted of the rear and fortified regions." (*My Life,* II, 203)

As a related consequence of the Brest policy Bolshevik territory was ruled by military dictators. Instead of being "servants of society" as promised by Lenin in his 1917 paper program, the heads of the administration were set up by him as military *masters* of society. The common delusion is that the "Soviet government" has always been a civil power, but when the cobwebs are brushed away from facts, it becomes obvious that it has been a *military* government since its inception. The power immediately after the Revolution was distributed in gradation: "on the 29th of November (12th of December) 1917, the Central Committee elected for the solution of pressing questions a bureau composed of four persons: 'Stalin, Lenin, Trotsky and Sverdlov.'" (*Stalin,* 240). In reality the power was in the hands of the Big Three: "Sverdlov, however, was absorbed by the Secretariat of the Party, spoke at meetings, settled conflicts and was seldom at the Smolny. The foursome practically came down to a threesome." (240-1). Trotsky says the "threesome" existed only until the seat of the government was transferred to Moscow in March 1918. Facts indicate that the "threesome" lasted until it was displaced by the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev Trio.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Personal Conflicts Among the Bolshevik Military Dictators*

The career cancer in the Sovnarkom's Army is strikingly illustrated by personal jealousies which were seething in the commanding personnel around the chief dictator in the Kremlin. Although this feature in the Red Army was a strongly guarded secret, bits of information found their way into the records. Thus, Antonov-Ovseenko mentions that "Comrade Kikvidze was clearly offended by my appointment (he already had styled himself 'the chief commander of the Ukrainian Soviet forces')." (*Notes,* II, 18). "Sablin had serious quarrels with Kikvidze who considered himself unjustly passed up and did not want to submit to the Army Commander." (98). Trotsky tells of a factional development arising on the basis of rivalry between "Commander-in-Chief Vatzetis and the commanding officer of the Eastern Front, S.S. Kamenev. Both of them had been General Staff colonels of the Tsarist Army. No doubt there was rivalry between them. And the Commissars became involved in that conflict." (*Stalin,* 310)

No sooner had Stalin been confirmed by Trotsky in the role of a military dictator of Tsaritsin than deep rivalry developed between these two strongest Party burocrats in the Red Army. Whether Stalin aimed for Trotsky's high post is not clear. At any rate, enlisting the support of the local military functionaries and their leader Voroshilov, Stalin began undermining Trotsky. One of the forms of digging away at Trotsky's authority was their utter disregard for the orders of the High Commander, Vatzetis, and of other eminent officers. Trotsky recorded this daring insubordination: "Every day I would receive from the High Command and the front commanders complaints against Tsaritsin. They could not get executions of orders, could not get information what went on there, even to get an answer to an inquiry. Lenin watched the conflict develop with alarm. He knew Stalin better than I, and obviously suspected that the stubbornness of Tsaritsin was being managed by Stalin behind the scenes." (*My Life,* II, 173-4)

Trotsky intervened directly and sent his orders to the Tsaritsin insubordinates. Voroshilov cites a former military specialist Nosovich, eventually a deserter to the Whites, to the effect that Stalin wrote on one of Trotsky's orders "To be ignored!" (*Life of Stalin, A Symposium,* 58). Trotsky confirms this. (*Stalin,* 280)

Stalin's contemptuously factional reaction to the orders of the "comrade" who had been placed by the Sovnarkom above all high figures in the Red Army is strikingly expressed in his message to Lenin dated October 3, 1918:

"We have received Trotsky's telegraph order a copy of which you have probably already received, as well as the reply to it. We consider that this order, written by a man who does not have the least understanding about the Southern Front, threatens to deliver the entire cause of the Front and the Revolution in the South into the hands of General Sitin, a man not only not needed at the Front but one who

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

does not deserve confidence and is therefore harmful. We, naturally, do not agree to ruin the Front for the sake of one unreliable general. Trotsky may cover himself with phrases about discipline but anybody will realize that Trotsky is not the Military Revolutionary Council of the Republic and Trotsky's order is not an order of the Council.

"Orders have some sort of meaning only when they are based on the knowledge of forces and on the know how. To put the Front into the hands of a man who does not deserve confidence, as Trotsky does, means to trample upon the elementary understanding of proletarian discipline and on the interests of the Revolution and the Front. In view of this we, as members of the Party, categorically declare that we consider the carrying out of Trotsky's orders as criminal and his threats unworthy.

"The Central Committee of the Party must discuss the question of the conduct of Trotsky who ill-treats the most outstanding Party members for the sake of traitor war specialists and to the detriment of the interests of the Front and the Revolution. To place on the agenda the question of impermissibility of issuance of individual orders by Trotsky..." (*Documents,* etc. 389)

The explanation for Stalin's contemptuous disregard for all authority, except Lenin's, is not difficult to find, and one need go no further than Trotsky's elucidating remarks in *Stalin:* "In the Tsarist Army, in addition to military subordination there existed an unwritten subordination: the Grand Dukes who held one or another commanding or high administrative post often ignored their superior officers and introduced chaos in the administration of the Army and Navy. I remember remarking to Lenin that Stalin, taking undue advantage of his position as member of the Central Committee of the Party, was introducing the regime of the Grand Dukes in our army." (270)

According to Trotsky, "The attitude of the Tsaritsin military heads toward the command of the Southern Soviet front did not differ much from their attitude toward the Whites." (*My Life,* II, 173). Ostensibly fighting *unitedly* for a noble ideal against a common foe, the powerful ambitious burocrats quarrelled about supplies for their respective armies. The Stalin-Voroshilov clique, Trotsky wrote, "kept in Moscow a special representative of the Tsaritsin army, a sailor named Zhivodior, to *extort* supplies." (*Ib.* Our emph.—G.S.)

Stalin bolstered his military intrigue with an accusation advanced either by himself or by one of the burocrats under his influence—according to Trotsky's testimony. In December 1918 an article was published in *Pravda* charging Trotsky with having shot "the best comrades without trial." Trotsky states that he was shocked and puzzled as to the real reason behind the publication of that article. "The riddle was solved when I discovered upon investigation that the author of the article or rather the man who signed it, A. Kamensky was on the staff of the Tenth Army and at the time was under the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

direct influence of Stalin. It is beyond doubt that Stalin surreptitiously assured the publication of the article." (*Stalin*, 299). Whether Trotsky directed Lenin's attention to the hand behind that charge is not clear. "The Central Committee settled the matter. I recall that Kamensky and the editorial board were reprimanded, but Stalin's manipulating hand remained invisible." (300)

If under the camouflage of revolutionary words the burocrats could push their intrigues against each other at Congresses and into the columns of the official press, as Trotsky's comment indicates, then one can gauge the degree of putrefaction the Bolshevik leaders had reached by the first anniversary of the October Revolution.

5. *Lenin Fights for Stalin*

In the Tsarist army even the Grand Dukes were subject to the autocratic power above them. Stalin in 1918 was far from the absolute personal rule he achieved years later. In the military field Trotsky, who stood above him in rank, shaped a chapter of his own in the history of the Bolshevik State. The War Commissar resolved to enforce discipline in the local affairs of Tsaritsin, but since Stalin maintained the "Grand Duke" independent attitude, the only step left was to depose Stalin from his dictator's post. Had it been a case of an ordinary recalcitrant burocrat, Trotsky would have crushed him directly by applying iron war-time measures. Men who committed mild offenses as compared with Stalin's were committed to a tribunal and sent to prison for many years. For daring to write on the order of the highest authority in the Army "To be ignored!" a lesser burocrat would have been shot. But a Central Committee "Grand Duke" could not be touched by Trotsky. The mutinous burocrat was one of the "Foursome," and Trotsky had to appeal to the other two.

In general, the heads of the Bolshevik State observed no special ceremonies in the process of removing ordinary burocrats from their posts. But in the specific case of Stalin they had to apply a tactic denoting profound respect. So, complying with Trotsky's demand, Sverdlov took a special train from Moscow to carry back with him the high personage from Tsaritsin: "The situation became intolerable. I decided to enforce order in Tsaritsin. After a new clash between the Command and Tsaritsin, I obtained Stalin's recall. It was done through the medium of Sverdlov, who himself went in a special train to bring Stalin back." (*My Life*, II, 174)

Stalin had tasted military dictatorial power and he liked it. And now occurred a noteworthy phenomenon. Instead of punishing the culprit, Lenin humored Stalin not only by letting him remain in the Army but by *advancing* him to the membership in the Revolutionary Military Council of the Southern Front! Lenin got busy patching up the relations between the two foremost Party burocrats in the Army. In a letter to Trotsky, stating that "Stalin is anxious to work on the Southern front," Lenin said: " 'In informing you, Lev Davidovich, of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

all these statements of Stalin's, I ask you to consider them and reply, first, do you agree to talk the matter over with Stalin? For this he agrees to visit you. And second, do you think it possible to remove previous friction and on certain concrete conditions arrange joint work as Stalin so much desires?' " (176). And then came the most significant sentence of all: " 'As for me, I think it necessary to make every effort to arrange joint work with Stalin. *Lenin.*' " (176-7)

How can this secret magic relationship between Lenin and Stalin be explained? The fact is, Stalin was a *favorite* of Lenin's and by degrees Lenin elevated him in power from the very period of the October Revolution. This is verified by Trotsky himslef: "After the conquest of power, Stalin began to feel more sure of himself, remaining, however, a figure of the second rank. I soon noticed that Lenin was 'advancing' Stalin, valuing in him his firmness, grit, stubbornness, and to a certain extent his slyness, as attributes necessary in the struggle. He did not expect of him any independent ideas, political initiative or creative imagination." (*Stalin,* 243)

In a word, Lenin found in Stalin an ideal burocratic "man Friday." Lenin's appreciation of Stalin's organizing ability ran back to the pre-1917 epoch: "No doubt, Lenin came to appreciate Stalin's ability as a practical organizer during the parlous times of the reaction of 1907-1913." (351). Although in one place Trotsky says that Stalin's coarseness repelled Lenin, in the same work Trotsky indicates the very opposite: "The ability to 'exert pressure' was what Lenin prized so highly in Stalin." (270). Only an exceptionally coarse, rude, unduly rigorous burocrat could answer the need in building a burocratic machine. And there were not too many Stalins to go around. Party leaders appreciated Stalin's usefulness in overwhelming the workers and lower functionaries. When Trotsky tested the ground for getting rid of Stalin from the Southern Front he saw the reaction: "I remember during the Civil War asking a member of the Central Committee, Serebryakov, who at that time was working with Stalin in the Revolutionary Council of War of the Southern Front, whether he could not manage without Stalin for the sake of economizing forces? Serebryakov replied: 'No, I cannot exert pressure like Stalin.' " (*Ib*). And if Stalin's aptitude qualified him as a key man "to exert pressure," the nature of the burocratic machine fitted perfectly to his administrative abilities: "There were two aspects to military work in the epoch of the Civil War. One was to select the necessary workers, to make proper disposition of them, to establish the necessary supervision over the commanding staff, to extirpate the suspects, to exert pressure, to punish. All of these activities of the administrative machine suited Stalin's talents to perfection." (*Ib.*)

While Trotsky may have been as good at exerting pressure as Stalin, no one could excel Trotsky in demagogic appeals to the workers and Red Army men. Both burocrats were of inestimable value to the head of the regime. Lenin spent much time in consulting not only

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with Trotsky but also with Stalin. On this point about the Lenin-Stalin relations, Trotsky cites Stalin's assistant Pestkovsky: "The same Pestkovsky refers to close collaboration between Lenin and Stalin. 'Lenin could not get along without Stalin even for a single day. Probably for that reason our office in the Smolny was "under the wing" of Lenin. In the course of the day, he would call Stalin out an endless number of times, or would appear in our office and lead him away. Most of the day Stalin spent with Lenin.'" And Trotsky adds from himself: "At that period, Lenin had great need of Stalin. There can be no doubt about that." (247). Investigation discloses that Lenin had great need of Stalin not only "at that period" but in *all* the years of the Civil War, and Trotsky inadvertently indicates this himself. To begin with, Stalin was practically indispensable to Lenin in securing a grip on national minorities: "In that sphere Stalin was an irreplaceable assistant to Lenin." (258). Lenin was building up Stalin's authority in that field as in all others. Stalin's knowledge of the Caucasian peoples was of great value in drawing them into the Russian State system: "Lenin valued these attributes of Stalin's which were not shared by others, and in every way tried to bolster Stalin's authority in the eyes of all sorts of national delegations. 'Talk it over with Stalin. He knows that question well. He knows the conditions. Discuss the question with him.' Such recommendations were repeated by him scores and hundreds of times." (*Ib.*) When Shaumian, the Bolshevik leader of Baku, attempted a direct correspondence with Lenin, he received Lenin's instruction: "Better send letters through Stalin." (*Documents,* 289)

Lenin took the Commissariat of Nationalities under his wing in the Politburo, with the result that in any disputes in this department his man Friday always came out on top: "On all those occasions when Stalin had serious conflicts with the national delegates, or in his own collegium, the question was referred to the Politburo, where all the decisions were invariably brought out in favor of Stalin. This should have reinforced his authority even more in the eyes of the ruling circles of the backward nationalities; in the Caucasus, on the Volga, and in Asia. The new burocracy of the national minorities later became a not unimportant bulwark of Stalin's power." (*Stalin,* 258)

If Trotsky was a self-made figure, Stalin was a Lenin-made man—but with Trotsky's important aid. Trotsky was a permanent member of the Politburo, so the support the Politburo gave to Stalin against delegates from the Caucasus, Ukraine and other national non-Russian segments of the Bolshevik State was shared by Trotsky to please Lenin. It was Trotsky, as we have seen, who formulated the dictatorial powers of Stalin in South Russia.

There was no other Party leader so enriched with favors, so treated with partiality by the founder of the Bolshevik regime as was Stalin. Lenin pampered his favored burocrat in many ways. For example, when in the early period in the Kremlin Stalin decided to change his

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

apartment for a quieter one, Lenin personally came to his assistance. As testified to by Trotsky, Lenin even brought pressure to bear to secure some rooms for Stalin in the Palace of the Kremlin: "Stalin wanted to change his, which were very noisy, for some more peaceful. The agent of the Cheka, Belenki, recommended some reception rooms in the Palace in the Kremlin. My wife opposed this: the Palace was reserved as a museum." (Trotsky, "Behind the Kremlin Walls," *New Int.* March 1939, 71). It is apparent that Stalin ran to Lenin with complaints and Lenin immediately took a hand in the affair: "Lenin wrote a long letter of remonstrance to my wife: We can take the furniture of the 'museum' away from several of the rooms of the Palace; we can take particular measures for protecting the place; Stalin needs an apartment in which he can sleep tranquilly." (*Ib*). Finally, Lenin appointed a commission to find out whether the Palace rooms under consideration could be converted into living quarters. When the Commission brought in a negative report, "the affable and accomodating Serebriakov gave Stalin his apartment." (72). There is no reason to doubt that Serebriakov was accommodating not Stalin but Lenin.

On Stalin's part up to 1922 there was no lack of effort to play up to Lenin's burocratic ego which thrived on standing above all the other Bolshevik leaders as the highest authority and the most revered and beloved "Old Man." "Ardent greetings to our beloved elder Comrade Lenin." (From Stalin's letter to Lenin, August 7, 1918, *Documents,* 243)

Apart from various other factors, one reason why Stalin was able to subtly advance his personal career was the fact that up to 1922 he was careful not to disagree with Lenin on important matters of policy. Indeed, it probably did not escape his shrewd eye that only full agreement with the policy pursued by Lenin could guarantee his own success. This line of caution was followed also by his secret factional friends Zinoviev and Kamenev. "It often happened that Stalin, Zinoviev, or Kamenev disagreed with me on some question of first importance, but as soon as they learned that Lenin agreed with me, they lapsed into silence." (*My Life,* II, 196)

6. *Trotsky's Deference to Lenin on the Stalin Issue*

With increasing evidence that he was Stalin's picked target, Trotsky at the same time realized that Lenin gave Stalin special consideration. "Lenin insisted that it was necessary for me to conclude a compromise with Stalin." (*Stalin,* 295). Although probably sorely tempted to reject Lenin's insistence that Stalin be kept in the high circle of the Military Command, Trotsky kept in mind Lenin's fondness for Stalin. "I replied stating my full accord, and Stalin was appointed a member of the Revolutionary Military Council of the southern front. Alas, the compromise brought no results." (*My Life,* II, 177)

Trotsky went to the extent of showing that he was favorably

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

disposed toward Lenin's keen interest in Stalin. Proposing at the end of November 1918 the formation of a Council of Defense, Trotsky, on the transparently hypocritical pretext of giving Stalin the opportunity to present his "criticism" openly, suggested that Stalin be one of the members on that high body: "By agreement with Lenin I proposed that Stalin be also included. Lenin wanted to give Stalin some satisfaction for removing him from the Army in Tsaritsin; I wanted to give Stalin the chance to formulate openly his criticisms and proposals, without wetting the powder in the War Department." (*Stalin,* 291-2)

Exhibiting his reliance on Stalin on almost every important occasion, Lenin, upon receiving alarming news from the Perm front, telegraphed to Trotsky: "Moscow, December 31, 1918. There are several Party reports from around Perm about the catastrophic conditions of the Army and about drunkenness. I am forwarding them to you. They ask that you come there. I thought of sending Stalin. I am afraid Smilga will be too soft with Lashevitch, who it is said drinks himself and is unable to restore order. Telegraph your opinion." (quoted in *Stalin,* 293). Trotsky saw from the text that the Party circles in the Perm district wanted *his* presence, but he also saw that Lenin's choice was Stalin. This meant that Stalin wanted to go to Perm. Trotsky of course was guided by the subtle essence of Lenin's telegram, not by the wishes of some obscure Party members in the Perm area. Trotsky's reply read: "I agree to Stalin's journey with powers from both the Party and the Revolutionary Council of War of the Republic for restoring order, purging the staff of Commissars, and severely punishing the guilty." (*Ib.*)

Trotsky continued fulfilling the promise he evidently had given himself to meet Lenin more than half way on the question of advancing Stalin. Even after a year-and-a-half of Stalin's continuous intrigues, Trotsky took the initiative in drawing Stalin into the supreme military body of the State. (273)

7. *Stalin Widens the Intrigue*

If Trotsky knew it was impossible to eliminate Stalin from the Army without crossing swords with Lenin, he also understood that this held equally true for Stalin's bosom companion and co-plotter Voroshilov. Trotsky sought at least to secure Lenin's consent to sever Voroshilov's connection with the local Tsaritsin Stalinists by shifting this mutinous chief to the Ukraine.

Connected with the transfer of Voroshilov was the case of Okulov, Trotsky's key man in the counter-intrigue against the Stalin-Voroshilov clique. Trotsky had appointed Okulov to the Tsaritsin staff to exert pressure on Voroshilov. In Moscow Stalin sought to incite Lenin against Okulov, requesting that he be recalled from Tsaritsin. Trotsky resisted, offering Lenin and Stalin a compromise in the form of the transfer of Voroshilov to the Ukraine. In the same dispatch he admitted frankly the original purpose of appointing Okulov to the Tsar-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

itsin front: "The question of recalling Okulov cannot be decided by itself. Okulov was appointed as a counterbalance to Voroshilov, as a guarantee that military orders would be carried out." (*Stalin*. 292). Stalin was willing to accept the compromise; therefore there was no objection from Lenin to retaining Okulov in Tsaritsin and having Voroshilov go to the Ukraine. In less than a month after the transfer, however, Voroshilov made it plain that though he was in a new territory, his policy was the same as in Tsaritsin. On the 10 of January 1919 Trotsky, quite exasperated, sent a sharply-worded telegram to Sverdlov: "I state categorically that the Tsaritsin policy which has led to the complete disintegration of the Tsaritsin army cannot be tolerated in the Ukraine. The Ukrainians are in collapse, there are clique struggles due to the absence of responsible and authoritative leaders. Okulov is leaving for Moscow. I suggest that you and Comrade Lenin give utmost attention to his report dealing with the work of Voroshilov and Rukhimovich. The line of Stalin, Voroshilov and Rukhimovich spells ruin for our entire enterprise." (Quoted by N. Markin in *Bull. Opp.* June-July 1930, 38; *Stalin School* App. 210-211)

Lenin did not wait for Okulov's arrival. He understood well that the report contained details of Voroshilov's disruptive disobeying of orders, cliquism and reckless disregard for the general burocratic interests of the Sovnarkom regime. Trotsky in his dispatches implied that he wanted to rid the Army of Voroshilov. But if Lenin had carried out Trotsky's wish and removed Stalin's crony he would have thereby hurt the feelings of his favorite. So Lenin stepped into that careerist mess again as a diplomatic arbitrator. Having previously witnessed Trotsky's moral depravity in agreeing to a compromise with the disrupter in Tsaritsin, Lenin urged Trotsky to come to terms with Voroshilov in the Ukraine. Trotsky once more consented to a compromise, but specified that the settlement, actually a capitulation on his part, must not be "rotten," that is, Voroshilov would be forgiven if he from then on obeyed discipline. In his reply on the 11 of January 1919 Trotsky employed very strong words with respect to Stalin: "A compromise is of course necessary, but not a rotten one. In the real sense of the matter, all the Tsaritsinites have gathered in Kharkov. What the Tsaritsinites are, you will read in the Okulov's report which throughout consists of factual material and reports of commissars. I consider Stalin's patronage of the Tsaritsin tendency a most dangerous ulcer, worse than any treason or betrayal by military specialists." (*Ib*). Trotsky concluded by reiterating his request to Lenin: "Once again I urge that you read carefully Okulov's report describing how Voroshilov with Stalin's cooperation demoralized the Tsaritsin Army."

8. *Stalin Embarrasses his Protector*

Fully confident that he was under Lenin's protective wing, Stalin, arriving in the Ukraine, resumed his "Grand Duke" Tsaritsin attitude. The Commander of the Front, Yegorov, issued an operative order

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which Stalin refused to sign and thus left it ineffective. " 'I won't sign it,' he declared, in order to show off his importance to his collaborators and to his subordinates." (*Stalin,* 296-7). The political Commissar Berzin, also obligated to sign Yegorov's order, drew back in dismay. "In view of the refusal of a member of the Central Committee to sign the orders, Berzin did not dare to place his own signature on it." (296). When it concerned small, inoffensive fellows, Trotsky stood on no polite ceremony. His peremptory instruction to Berzin over the direct wire was: " 'Sign it immediately; otherwise, you will be turned over to the Tribunal." (297). But towards the real offender Trotsky conducted himself quite differently: "The question passed to the Politburo. Lenin said, not without embarrassment: 'What can we do about it? Stalin again caught in the act!' " (*Ib.*)

Stalin was recalled from the Southern Front, and by way of "punishment" was appointed by Lenin to the Southwestern Front.

9. *Stalin Intrigues in Petrograd*

If Tsaritsin was an incidental starting point in Stalin's military career, Petrograd was a high water mark. And between the two Stalin established a solid reputation for himself among the high circles of the Party. He was a distinguished bone-crusher, fearless, brutal and cynical, intertwining his army work with his intrigue. Lenin's obvious indulgence towards him automatically transformed Stalin into a counterweight to Trotsky's excessive burocratic power.

When the military specialists in the Petrograd region organized a conspiracy in the Spring of 1919 and the White Army under General Yudenich began a surprise offensive, Lenin called on Stalin to handle the situation. "With special powers from the Central Committee of the Party and the Soviet Government, Stalin arrived in Petrograd in the latter part of May 1919." (306). These few pale words hardly describe the scope of Stalin's power. Lenin invested his favorite with truly enormous authority: "All instructions of Comrade Stalin are obligatory for all institutions, all departments in the region of the Western Front. Comrade Stalin has the privilege to act in the name of the Council of Defense, to remove and bring before the Military-Revolutionary Tribunal all guilty functionaries. Comrade Stalin has the privilege to commandeer separate locomotives for special trips on all railways of the RSFSR and is first in order to conduct conversations on direct wires and to send military telegrams." (*Documents on Heroic Defense of Petrograd in* 1919, R. 1941, 14-15; Lenin, *War Correspondence,* 1917-1918, R. 68)

In a couple of weeks Stalin repaired the havoc created by the Tsarist specialists. After the recapture of many forts surrounding Petrograd, including the Krasnaya Gorka which was taken through an unusual naval operation, Stalin, bursting with pride, telegraphed his Patron: "Lightning mopping up and reinforcement of the forts and fortresses now in full swing. The naval specialists assure me that the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

capture of Krasnaya Gorka from the sea turns upside down all naval science. All I can do about it is to weep over so-called science. The rapid capture of Gorka is explained by the rudest intervention by me and by other civilians, in operational matters, which reached the point of cancelling orders on land and sea and imposing our own orders." (*Life of Stalin,* 67; *Stalin,* 306-7)

Taking his initial success over Yudenich as a point of departure in weaving the anti-Trotsky intrigue from Petrograd, Stalin, on June 4, 1919 sent his Patron a secret dispatch of amazing contents. Using a document found on a Swiss citizen as a cover, Stalin indirectly implied that the staff of the Revolutionary Council of War of the Republic, whose chairman was Trotsky, was working for the Whites. "It is now up to the Central Committee to draw the necessary inferences. Will it have the courage to do it?" he asked. (Quoted in *Stalin,* 308). Evidently the Central Committee did not have "the courage" to discard Trotsky's line of using the specialists. But while Lenin would not agree to change that line, he heeded Stalin's request in another phase of the intrigue against Trotsky. In that dispatch Stalin wrote these meaningful words against Trotsky's man Okulov: "Workers like Okulov, who incite the specialists against our commissars, who are sufficiently discouraged anyway, are harmful, because they debilitate the vitality of our army." (*Ib.*)

Okulov had been a thorn in Stalin's side ever since the Tsaritsin period. Okulov, a member of the Revolutionary Council of War, was an incorrigible meddler in the activities of the Stalin-Voroshilov clique. In that he merely carried out Trotsky's orders. Lenin, knowing exactly who the *actual* intriguer was, wrote to Trotsky's assistant Sklyansky: "Stalin demands the recall of Okulov who *allegedly* is preoccupied with intrigues and disorganizing work." (309). Sklyansky's anti-Stalin retort was: "Okulov is the only decent worker there." (*Ib.*). Lenin evidently acted on Stalin's charge against Okulov, because on the same day, June 4, 1919 "the only decent worker there" was removed through a formal decision of the Central Committee.

Trotsky knew that Stalin had won a tremendous point over him. From Trotsky's testimony no other conclusion is possible except that Okulov was a victim of a Stalinist frame-up: "As for Okulov's guilt, that consisted solely in his earnest endeavour to abide most faithfully by all orders and regulations and in his outright refusal to take part in any intrigues against the Center." (*Ib.*). What was Trotsky's reaction to the frame-up and recall of Okulov? He accepted both without even a formal protest. "This was a necessary concession to Stalin and Zinoviev. There was nothing to do but to accept it." (*Ib.*)

If the man was framed, why was it necessary for Trotsky to concur in such an outrageous act? The reason is not difficult to detect. Behind the Stalinist frame-up of Okulov stood the founder of the Bolshevik State and the Chief of the Sovnarkom burocracy. It was impossible to reveal the Stalin intrigue to the soldiers, to the workers or even to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the burocracy itself. A bigger figure than both Stalin and Trotsky was involved and the entire burocratic cause might have been placed in jeopardy. "There was nothing to do but to accept it."

10. *The Intrigue in the Polish War*

In April 1920 the Army of the Polish landlords and capitalists invaded the Ukraine. The Sovnarkom's Army counter-attacked, recaptured Kiev and advanced toward Warsaw and Lvov. Lack of coordination due to the internal intrigues among the high Party burocrats brought on a military disaster and heavy casualties: "One of the reasons that the catastrophe near Warsaw assumed such extraordinary proportions was the behavior of the command of the Western group of the Southern Armies, directed against Lwow (Lemberg). The chief political figure in the Revolutionary Council of War of the group was Stalin. He wanted at any cost to enter Lwow at the same time that Smilga and Tukhachevsky were to enter Warsaw." (328). In his attempt to hit Stalin, Trotsky exposes his own burocratic dishonesty in having concealed at the time the personal motivations that played an important part in the high circles of the Red Army.

The early versions of the Stalin historians omitted any accusations against Trotsky in connection with the Polish War. Later they blamed Trotsky: "As regards the troops on the Southern Front, who had reached the gates of Lvov and were pressing the Poles hard, they were forbidden by Trotsky, that ill-famed 'Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council' to capture Lvov. He ordered the transfer of the Mounted Army, the main force on the Southern Front, far to the north-east. This was done on the pretext of helping the Western Front, although it was not difficult to see that the best, and in fact only possible, way of helping the Western Front was to capture Lvov." (*Hist. C.P.S.U.* 242)

Since the capture of Lvov would have immensely enhanced Stalin's prestige and brought him within reach of Trotsky's high post, it is not improbable that for factional reasons Trotsky wanted to prevent the triumph of the man who daily darkened his existence. And yet, from the point of view of Lenin's system of Army discipline, Trotsky was within his commanding rights in ordering assistance to the Warsaw Front, while Stalin, a subordinate, flagrantly flouted both discipline and the general burocratic interests when he once again refused to carry out orders: "Stalin was waging his own war. When the danger to Tukhachevsky's army became clearly evident and the Commander-in-Chief ordered the Southwestern Front to shift its direction sharply toward Zamostye-Tomashev, in order to strike at the flanks of the Polish troops near Warsaw, the command of the Southwestern Front, encouraged by Stalin, continued to move to the West: Was it not more important to take possession of Lwow itself than to help 'others' to take Warsaw? For three or four days our General Staff could not secure the execution of this order. Only after repeated demands rein-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

forced by threats did the Southwestern command change direction, but by then the delay of several days had already played its fatal role." (*Stalin,* 329)

The rumor about the Lvov scandal reached a wide layer of Party burocrats and could not be easily brushed aside as had been the Tsaritsin and similar intrigues including the Okulov frame-up. Trotsky, Tukachevsky and other high authorities in the Army were fuming with "revolutionary" rage, for here Stalin was actually skirting the edge of high treason. "The Polish war placed on his reputation—at least, in the more well-informed circles of the Party—an ineradicable stain." (*Stalin,* 271). The scandal was taken up at the Tenth Congress of the Party. (March 8-16, 1921). Against the sombre background of mass starvation and death throughout the country, the affair was discussed by the careerists and usurpers in secrecy. "During the secret debates on the Polish War at a closed session of the Tenth Congress of the Party, Stalin came out with the declaration, equally startling in its viciousness and untruthfulness, that Smilga, the leading member of the Revolutionary Council of War of the Western Front had 'deceived the Central Committee' by 'promising' to take Warsaw by a definite date and by failing to make good his 'promise'. The actions of the Southwestern Front, i.e. of Stalin himself, had presumably been determined by the 'promise' of Smilga, on whom, therefore, lay the responsibility for the catastrophe." (329)

We have seen Lenin's reaction to Antonov-Ovseenko's humble criticism of orders from above. In that year Stalin, as we have shown both from the Trotsky and the Stalin sources, defied orders and his defiance went unpunished. He was even rewarded with more power. In the summer of 1919 Lenin laid down the following stern thesis on the matter of insubordination: "One who does not aid the Red Army fully and selflessly and does not uphold in it order and discipline is a betrayer and traitor, a partisan of Kolchakovism, and must be ruthlessly destroyed." (*Pravda,* Aug. 28, 1919; XVI, R. 322). But what was Lenin's attitude toward Stalin who repeatedly refused to carry out orders and who was blamed for the catastrophe on the Polish Front? According to Trotsky, "Lenin, terribly upset by the dissentions, joined in the discussion and expressed himself to the effect that we did not want to blame anybody personally." (*Stalin,* 329)

A few months after the Lvov scandal Lenin, knowing the true reason for the defeat at Warsaw, told the following story: "Comrades, you, of course, also know that the temporary failure we suffered in the war with Poland and the straitened position we found ourselves in at certain moments of the war were due to the fact that we were obliged to fight Wrangel." (Report to the Eighth Congress of Soviets, *S.W.* VIII, 248). Thus we see that Lenin would give neither the Trotsky version nor that of the Stalin historians who put the blame on Trotsky. Lenin resorted to other fictitious explanations. He spoke of "the heavy defeat suffered by our forces near Warsaw as a result

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

/5.0
ACCEPT-

of the undoubted overexhaustion from which they were suffering because of the war..." (*Ib.*). The Bolshevik burocrats in the Lenin days mouthed the "explanations" closely resembling those advanced by Lenin. Thus, Radek at the Fourth Congress of the Comintern stated: "The abortive result of Soviet Russia's offensive against Warsaw and of the proletarian offensive in Italy had different causes. Soviet Russia, it turned out, was very weak militarily."

And even after Lenin's death, in 1924, Zinoviev, then a partner of Stalin's in the Trio, stated in the course of an attack on Trotsky: "We are justified in saying that the army was determined 'to have Warsaw,' we know that our bare-footed peasant soldiers of the Red Army fought with the courage of lions. Unfortunately, we were not strong enough." (*Inprecorr,* June 26, 1924, 371)

Even as late as 1930 the blame was laid on external circumstances, such as a supposedly skilful maneuver by the Polish Military Staff:

"Further, the White Poles executed a maneuver north from the direction of Lublin, as a result of which the Red Army, lacking the coordination of physical forces, scattered over a wide front, suffered defeat." (*Lesser Sov. Enc.* VI, 706)

All this sounded logical and true, but in the light of the later testimony of the Stalin and Trotsky schools of history the Bolshevik leaders consciously withheld from the workers the true story of the burocratic intrigue connected with that military defeat.

11. *The Sovnarkom Usurpers Wine and Dine; the Masses Starve and Fight*

During the turbulent months of 1917 Lenin spoke many great and noble words about measures to relieve the workers from the pressure of hardships. That part of Bolshevik propaganda, just as the phrases about the road towards workers democracy, peace and world revolution, caught the popular fancy. Lenin in those months spoke of ameliorating the conditions of the workers *immediately*. "Had the proletariat of Russia shed its blood only to receive luxurious promises of mere political democratic reforms? Will it not demand and make sure that every toiler should see and feel a certain improvement in his life right now? That every family should have sufficient bread? That every child should have a bottle of good milk, and that no adult in a rich family should dare take extra milk until all the children are supplied? That the palaces and luxurious homes left by the Tsar and the aristocracy should not stand idle but should provide shelter to the homeless and the destitute?" (*C.W.* XX, Bk. I, 53-4). In *words* the 1917 thesis on helping the starving workers remained in force. "The workers are in a state of exhaustion from lack of food," wrote Lenin in *Izvestia* of January 18, 1919. "We must bring all our resources into play to help the workers, to secure them a short respite, to improve their condition in every way we can."

Two months later, at the Eighth Congress, an ugly picture was

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

presented of the Party's divergence in *practice* from the words Lenin had penned in 1917 and in January 1919. A delegate, Minkov, though ready to reconcile himself to the bribing of specialists, pleaded with Lenin and others at the helm to make that bribery less painful to the workers: "Concerning the specialists I must say, true, we should pay them more than the workers, but it is not proper to place them in such privileged conditions in which they are now being placed."

Those at the Congress who repeated Lenin's January words about the need of mitigating the condition of the workers were subjected to severe pressure by the all-out supporters of the Sovnarkom regime. The head of the trade unions, Tomsky, took Riazanov to task: "Comrade Riazanov is wrong when he says: 'We must be brave and declare the widest support to the needs of the working class.' In this hall there is not a single person who would not wish to give the working class all that is possible. But we cannot give more than we do. Such is the vicious circle of our situation. It costs something to maintain the Red Army. Consequently the working class must create a certain amount of surplus value which will go not only for the maintenance of the apparatus of the Soviet power and its Red Army but also to reestablish the shattered productive forces." (71-2) Tomsky was in reality defending the burocratic locusts who through the huge aggregation of privileged jobs were encouraged to devour whatever supplies there were, thereby depriving the starving masses of the barest necessities of life.

After the Congress, Zinoviev made a significant admission in the official press: "Has the Soviet Government, has our Party done everything that can be done for the direct improvement of the daily life of the average working-man and his family? Alas! We hesitate to give an affirmative answer to this question." (*Izvestia*, April 15, 1919). This admission came not as a result of honest reflection but under the pressure of widespread unrest among the workers. Though supporting the Sovnarkom, the workers were resorting to strikes as the only means left at their disposal to touch the "heart" of the Bolshevik burocrats. It is significant that in the face of the Civil War and intervention the workers struck the munition industry, and Lenin, while blaming the Mensheviks and SRs for the discontent among the masses, privately admitted that it was the Bolsheviks themselves who were at fault. One of the leading and oldest members of the Bolshevik Party testified: "The April 1919 strikes in the Tula rifle plants caused great uneasiness in the Central Committee and in the Sovnarkom. I was sent to Tula to take the necessary measures. Working together with the Tula Party organization we took measures for the speediest liquidation of the strike. When I returned from Tula I was called to Vladimir Ilyich. I told him how it had all happened: we had been directing our attention against the activities of the anti-Soviet parties, against the Anglo-French network of espionage, to the task of restoring production in the factories and only lastly to the miserable delivery of supplies. Having listened to my report Ilyich asked: 'How long were the workers

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

without bread?' 'For several days.' 'Our misfortune—Our fault—How do they tolerate us?' With these words Vladimir Ilyich, as if with a moral whip, struck himself and all of us. I left with a particularly heavy feeling of an overwhelming moral responsibility . . . " (Antonov-Saratovsky, *Proletarskaya Revolutsia,* 1934, No. 3, (26), 188)

It was in that period that Lenin stirred the hopes of the workers by laying down the apparently resolute line of rescuing them from hunger, cold and disease! "In a country which is devastated, the first task is to save the toiler. The first productive power of all mankind is the worker, the toiler. If he survives we shall be able to save and restore everything . . . Everything must be sacrificed in order to save the worker's existence." (Speech at the Congress on Extra-School Education, May 19, 1919; *Col. Wks.* XVI, R. 214, 215). But scintillating phrases grow pale in the face of Lenin's *actual* policy. Months were going by, with the gulf dividing the masses from the privileged burocracy widening. At the Ninth Congress of the Party (March 29—April 14, 1920), Lenin without reserve revealed his real attitude toward the appalling state of starvation inflicted on the masses by his Brest line: "And we declare that the masses will starve until the Red Army triumphs. It was necessary that the vanguard of the working class should make this sacrifice." (*S.W.* VIII, 93)

But did the Bolshevik leaders themselves starve while telling the workers and peasants to go hungry? Trotsky in an article "Behind the Kremlin Walls" inadvertently disclosed how the Bolshevik burocrats lived while the masses starved and the soldiers suffered from lack of food and supplies due to the virtual collapse of the transport: "To the Kremlin from the president of the Council of People's Commissars of Georgia, Budu Mdivani, came wine of Kakhetia. From Abkhasia, Nestor Lakoba sent boxes of mandarins." (*New Int.* March 1939, 71). Trotsky's illuminating testimony gives a picture of Lenin off the official stage: "In 1919 I learned by chance that Yenukidze had wine in his warehouse and I proposed its prohibition. 'This will be too severe,' Lenin told me, jokingly. I tried to insist: 'If the rumor reaches the front that in the Kremlin there is feasting I fear bad consequences.' The third one included in this conversation was Stalin. 'How then can we Caucasians,' he protested, 'get along without wine?' 'You see,' rejoined Lenin, 'you are not habituated to wine, but this would be an offense to the Georgians.' " (*Ib.*) In this passage Trotsky revealed the deep-seated fear of the soldiers: "If the rumor reaches the front . . . "! On keeping the concrete features of their depravity from the workers and soldiers Lenin and his corrupt burocratic coterie were of one mind.

In "Behind the Kremlin Walls" Trotsky describes feasting in the apartment of Kamenev, his brother-in-law and future partner in the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Bloc. The old Tsarist flunkeys in the Kremlin, the reader will observe, were still attending the Bolshevik burocrats: "I went to his place in the famous 'White Corridor.' One of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the old servants of the Kremlin with a particular gesture of deference and familiarity which at once placed me on guard, opened the door to Kamenev's apartment. At a large table several dignitaries of the Kremlin were seated with their wives. On the table stood bottles and dainties coming, of course, from Yenukidze's cooperative." In the factories, in the workers' homes, on the battlefields reigned cold, hunger, typhus and death. But the burocratic rulers of the Bolshevik State, and their kin, lived in warm comfort, their tables laden with wines and dainties.

What was Lenin's policy on the matter of privileges for the so-called revolutionary leaders and other burocrats in the midst of the misery and hunger of the masses? Here is an illustration:

"November 21, 1919. Comrade Enukidze! I urgently ask you to order a *certain amount of additional food supplies in* general (and with respect to the items indicated below, in particular) for the following comrades: The first: has arrived to aid the Soviet power. He is our guest. Assistance absolutely necessary. The second: founder of Finnish Social democracy. An old man. The Finns helped us very much prior to 1905. Now it is our duty to help them. Next, Keeley: an American engineer, came to assist the Soviet power. (Especially sugar, chocolate, cakes and candies)" (*Len. Sb.* XXIV, 318)

While the Bolshevik leaders who had set up the system of burocratic privileges, surrounded themselves with the halo of probity, they held up the petty officials before the workers as an evil affecting the Front. Lenin's press hypocritically printed moralizing phrases: "It is useless to talk about the need of economizing oil and gasoline—they are so indispensable for the Front. This is known to every worker. But what must he be thinking when he sees how his 'manager' rolls around in an automobile supposedly for business, drives to his country estate in the evening and returns in the morning. What is important here is not so much the waste of gasoline but the principle: in the Soviet Republic every worker must feel at every step that this is his power, the power of the workers." (J. Kliavin, *Pravda,* July 29, 1919)

Emelian Yaroslavsky covered up Lenin's system by focusing the angry attention of the resentful workers on the average burocrat: "With bitterness an old worker was telling me, as he looked on at a whole stream of daintily-attired 'Soviet functionaries' moving in the morning on the sidewalks of Moscow: 'You see these locusts? Before, too, they were eating us, and now they will devour us.'" (*Pravda,* Aug. 31, 1919). At the Eighth Party Congress it was reported: "There have been instances when responsible Party functionaries wrote out orders: 'deliver to so-and-so ten bottles of strong stuff' and shielded themselves with the name of the Party'" (*Sten. R.* 153). If under the condition of official prohibition Trotsky's and Stalin's officers secured alcoholic beverages, if Lenin himself in the midst of universal misery and starvation pampered his Georgian pet with Caucasian wine, and various guests with pastries and chocolate, why be surprised when

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

other "responsible party functionaries" provided their own pets and sycophants with a few bottles of "strong stuff"!

Although Zinoviev inside the Party Congress told a few crumbs of truth about the "Communists" grabbing the apartments and featherbeds of the bourgeoisie for themselves, to the proletariat outside he pictured these corrupt people, and by implication, the top-level Bolshevik burocrats including himself, as the most noble, selfless idealists: "To speak conscientiously, our Party is the best Party in the world; and the best existing people are the Communists." (*Petrogradskaya Pravda,* August 27, 1919). That was speaking "conscientiously"—in accord with Zinoviev's conscience.

Abroad, the petty-bourgeois hangers-on of the Lenin-Trotsky regime contributed their share in covering up the Bolshevik burocracy. In America the journal *Soviet Russia* cited an interview with a Left-Socialist supporter of the Bolshevik leadership, Nerman, who explained why the Lenin-Trotsky regime instituted prohibition in Russia: "Certain vicious elements desire to make use of the revolution only as a means of satisfying their own lusts, among which none the least was their strong desire for alcohol." (July 17, 1920, 57). The certain "vicious elements" incurred the undying enmity of the advanced workers in America and elsewhere. Little did these honest revolutionists suspect that among the "certain vicious elements" were the most eminent members of the Bolshevik Central Committee and high commanders of the Red Army.

12. *The Bolshevik Burocrats Restore Orders and Decorations*

The custom of bestowing "prizes of honor" on functionaries of the State, particularly in its military branch, is rooted in the reactionary interests of privileged social classes and castes. Feudal society developed a taste for stars, garters and other marks of distinction to emphasize the separation between the privileged aristocracy and the oppressed masses. In the bourgeois world the custom of conferring medals, ribbons, prizes and other marks of honor for distinguished service developed gradually. It reached a full expression in Napoleon's Army. The British imperialists during the Victorian Age turned the practice of decorating their illustrous lackeys into an organized system. It found its greatest application in the suppression of colonial revolts and in bourgeois wars.

After the defeat of the Nazi invasion of Russia a report of the May Day celebration in Moscow gave a brief glimpse of Premier Stalin and his military entourage: "The Premier was wearing the summer parade uniform of a Red Army officer. A handfull of Red Army marshals were gathered on lower level. They wore magnificent blue uniforms with gold epaulettes. On their chests shone rows of medals that covered their tunics from neck to belt." (*N.Y.T.* May 2, 1946). This was a revolting picture of burocratic rottenness. But who was

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the initiator of the practice of decorating the Red Army officers and men? Where was the starting point?

During the great proletarian upsurge of 1917, and particularly in the first days after the Bolshevik overturn, the soldiers of the October Army, imbued with the great ideal of international brotherhood of all toilers viewed with detestation the idea of rewards for services to the cause. If Stalin, Krylenko or any other leader had attempted to pin a mark of distinction on a soldier, the man would have torn it off with indignation. In line with that severely democratic, proletarian spirit the Sovnarkom in its decree of December 30, 1917 stated: "In fulfilment of the will of the revolutionary people which is concerned with the immediate and decisive eradication of every inequality in the army, the Sovnarkom decrees:" Then, after the announcement of the abolition of all titles: "To do away with all decorations and other signs of distinction." (*Collection of Decrees and Orders of the Workers and Peasants Government,* R. 1917, No. 9, 137)

With the formation of the Red Army, the decree of December 30, 1917 became just another verbal item in the Bolshevik archives. The truly democratic spirit, so vibrantly alive in the October Army, was not permitted in the Sovnarkom's military organization. On September 16, 1918, a few days after Trotsky addressed the Fifth Army with the pompous words, "Comrades, I thank you," Lenin issued a decree establishing the "Order of the Red Banner." Obviously a discussion about restoring decorations had taken place sometime earlier. On September 15, 1918 Voroshilov spoke over direct wire from Tsaritsin to Stalin who then was in Moscow: "Comrade Stalin, it is extremely necessary to deliver from the Center medals of distinction and rewards, if such have been already adopted." (*Documents,* etc. 254). On October 22, 1918, Trotsky arrived in Tsaritsin to tighten discipline and bring "health" to the Voroshilov forces there. Evidently despite Voroshilov's urgent request for medals six weeks before, they had not yet been received. Thereupon Trotsky on November 1, 1918 telegraphed Lenin and Sverdlov: "When will the medals be ready?" (*Stalin,* 291)

Since 1918 the reactionary custom of decorations and awards was firmly planted in the Sovnarkom's Army to imbue the recipients with personal pride. In the Fall of 1919 a medal was awarded to Trotsky himself: "In the Politbureau it was decided to confer on me the order of the Red Banner for the defense of Petrograd." (*My Life,* II, 165)

In this connection something very interesting occurred: "After the close of the meeting of the Politbureau, Kamenev, considerably embarrassed, introduced a proposal to award the order to Stalin. 'For what?' Kalinin asked, sincerely indignant. 'I can't understand why to Stalin?' He was pacified with a jest, and the proposal was accepted. During the recess Bukharin pounced on Kalinin. 'How is it you don't understand? This is Ilyich's idea. Stalin can't live unless he has what

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

some one else has. He will never forgive it.' I fully understood Lenin, and inwardly approved his attitude." (*Ib.*)

Every shabby act of the Sovnarkom served to gratify more and more the careerist ambitions of the Bolshevik burocrats. In the restoration of awards and decorations, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin found a new ground to promote corruption among themselves. Trotsky "understood Lenin" and participated in awarding the decoration to Stalin, knowing that Lenin had used the occasion to satisfy Stalin's vanity. "The award was impressively staged in the Bolshoy Theatre, where I made a report on the military situation before the joint session of the major Soviet institutions. When, toward the end, the chairman named Stalin, I tried to applaud. I was supported by two-three hesitant hand-claps. A cold bewilderment passed through the hall; especially noticeable after the ovations that had gone before. Stalin himself was wisely absent." (*Ib.*). But Trotsky was there to boost Lenin's favorite, presumably for services rendered to the international proletariat. Trotsky's base motive was to please Lenin and to appease Stalin who in Trotsky's own estimation represented an ulcer worse than any treason of the ex-Tsarist generals.

The Bolshevik careerists bestowed upon themselves medals and distinctive titles, such as: "Comrade Voroshilov—a Cavalier of the Order of the Red Banner." (*Krasnaya Gazeta,* June 19, 1920). The alleged proletarian-democratic revolutionists of 1917 became "cavaliers"! The Lenin-Trotsky regime was awarding not only decorations but adopted the Tsarist custom of presenting watches in the Army. For example, Sorin the Battalion Commander of the Kursk Regiment was awarded by the Zinoviev-controlled Petrograd Soviet the Order of the Red Banner and a watch.

13. *A Crass Expression of Personal Power*

Following his exile, Trotsky integrated into his writings the fiction that Lenin trusted him implicitly and mistrusted Stalin. As proof, Trotsky printed in his autobiography an official form dated July 1919 with a blank space and at the bottom of the form Lenin's endorsement of any future order by Trotsky, whatever it might be. (II, 205). Trotsky, with his ideas of burocratic license, failed to note that he revealed one of the crassest forms of the exercise of his personal burocratic power. Trotsky focused the reader's attention in a different direction. Weighing the blank order against the Testament, Trotsky made a deduction: "It is enough to compare these two texts—the unlimited moral confidence which Lenin placed in me, and the moral wolf's passport issued to Stalin—to realize in full measure the difference in Lenin's attitude toward me and toward Stalin." (II, 205)

Trotsky resorted here to a sleight of hand. The Testament was dated January 1923; the blank order, July 1919. A very pertinent question which Trotsky quite cleverly circumvented is: What was Lenin's attitude toward Stalin and Trotsky in 1919, in 1920, 1921 and first

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

half of 1922. The answer has been given by us in the preceding pages. But it is worth the space to give an additional illustration of Lenin's policy toward Stalin. In 1921, Stalin, without the knowledge of Trotsky and of the Commander-in-Chief, S.S. Kamenev, ordered the Second Army into a war against Menshevik Georgia. Presumably, Lenin himself was caught by surprise. But was he? The "Chronological Guide" appended to Trotsky's work *Stalin* records: "February 11—Red Army invades Georgia on Stalin's orders and confronts Politburo with accomplished fact. February 14—While Trotsky is in Urals, Politburo sanctions invasion of Georgia, advocated by Ordjonikidze and Stalin; decision revealed only to Council of War of Second Army; even Commander-in-Chief not told of it." (468). Attention must be called to the statement that the decision of the Politburo, at the head of which stood Lenin, was revealed only to the command of the Second Army which was already in action under Stalin, behind Trotsky's back. The reason for the secrecy was to afford Stalin a full opportunity for enhancing his prestige by permitting him direct control of the campaign without submitting to Trotsky. Trotsky, amazed and furious, telegraphed for information to his Deputy, Sklyansky, in Moscow: "Please write me a brief memorandum on the question of military operations against Georgia, when these operations began, by whose order, and the rest. I need the memorandum for the Plenum." (267). Whether Trotsky at the forthcoming plenum of the Central Committee protested the new version of the Tsaritsin policy and to what avail, we have been unable thus far to discover.

It is evident from this brief survey of Lenin's attitude toward Trotsky and Stalin that Trotsky gives a false interpretation to the carte blanche which Lenin gave him in July 1919. Lenin exempted Stalin from submitting to Trotsky's authority in army affairs. But what is most important, Lenin's carte blanche represents a gauge of the magnitude of his personal dictatorial power covered up with "democratic" phrases by the Sovnarkom penmen.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE NINTH CONGRESS OF THE R. C. P.— AN ANTI-LENIN REVOLT

1. *The Bolshevik Chiefs Branded as Burocratic Centralists*

ONE OF THE sharpest internal Bolshevik convulsions occurred at the Ninth Congress of the Party held from March 28 to April 4, 1920. At this Congress Lenin was sharply criticized for his burocratic system of power. No one, however, pointed out to the delegates Lenin's former statements against the method of appointing officials. One could pick those statements at random from his writings

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

before October when he with tireless emphasis had been denouncing the very *idea* of appointments: "The idea that it is necessary to 'guide' through officials 'appointed' from above is, at bottom, false, undemocratic, autocratic or it is a Blanquist *adventure*. Engels was fully right when, criticizing in 1891 the proposed programme of the German Social-Democrats who had become badly infected with burocratism, he insistently demanded that there be no supervision from above over local self-government." *(Pravda,* May 11, 1917; *C. W.* XX, Bk. II, 17)

In his report to the Ninth Congress, Lenin harshly attacked those who held the views he himself had expressed in 1917: "All these outcries against appointments, all this old and dangerous rubbish which finds its way into resolutions and conversations must be swept aside." *(S. W.* VIII, 92). Criticism against appointments became "old and dangerous rubbish"! Dangerous to whom? To the world proletariat? No, to the promoters of the system of patronage, of rottenness, of secret intrigue for personal glory, of *conscious betrayal.*

The opposition to Lenin was led by a group headed by Sapronov, Osinsky and Smirnov who called themselves "Democratic Centralists." Passions rose high after Lenin concluded his report. Oppositionist Maximovsky protested the insinuations that he and other Party critics of Lenin's policy were voicing Menshevik ideology and openly charged Lenin's Central Committee with burocratic centralism: "We are not children and you need not tell us that we are defending Menshevik views. We are defending democratic centralism which is inscribed in the statutes of the Party adopted at the December conference. We are defending democratic centralism in building the organs of Soviet power. What is democratic centralism? It is the line which was adopted at the December conference of our Party and affirmed by the Seventh Congress of the Soviets—and regarding which the Central Committee never had a definite opinion. The Central Committee is guilty of burocratic centralism. This is the crux of the matter. This centralism flourishes with all its accompanying evils." *(S. R.* 41)

Disgust with Lenin's burocratic centralism, which was relentlessly breaking even the limited "democracy" among the Party functionaries themselves, was vented by Maximovsky. He compared the Bolshevik Party to a putrid fish and hinted that Lenin was the head of that fish: "Fish are said to begin to putrify from the head downwards. The Party is beginning to suffer at the top from the influence of burocratic centralism. In this lies the crux of the matter and this explains the numerous discussions on the rule of individuals which is unacceptable to us or to anyone else—from the point of view adopted by our Party. These traits have expressed themselves in the practice of the Central Committee." (41-42)

Apparently not all the bitter words of the oppositionists found their way into the stenographic record. But the strong expressions did not go unnoted, and were seized upon by supporters of Lenin and remembered long afterward. It appears that the leader of the Demo-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cratic Centralists, Sapronov, went to the extent of stigmatizing Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Kamenev and other high leaders of the Party as oligarchs—in plain, as people who ruled for selfish, and therefore, for criminal ends. Some years afterward Stalin publicly brought out this point against Sapronov (*On the Opposition,* 74). At the Ninth Congress Sapronov's remark was stricken from the minutes; but in the record of Volin's reply to the oppositionists his reference to Sapronov's remark was not expunged, probably through an oversight: "Comrade Bubnov wanted to soften the impression when he said, oh, it is just an incidental proletarian little word. I wrote down all these proletarian little words. They are many, and I'll mention them, so that others don't repeat them . . . Comrade Maximovsky in speaking about the Party, likened it to a fish and the Central Committee to its head which begins to putrify . . . (noise, voices: no need repeating, we heard it). Comrade Sapronov speaks of a small set of the Party oligarchy." (*S. R.* 54)

Osinsky stated that the idea of democratic centralism was being attacked by Lenin. He also showed that Trotsky and Stalin had introduced a sharp turn toward preventing the Party organizations from democratic-centralist guidance of industry: "Further, in the unpublished part of Comrade Trotsky's theses the question was posed what to do with democratic centralism in the sphere of the Party, and the reply was: to substitute the political buros for the Party organizations not only on the railroads but in all basic branches of industry. Comrade Stalin, whom I profoundly respect but with whom I disagree on that question, anticipated Comrade Trotsky's idea and created a political buro in the Donets coal fields. All this must be considered in the general connection as a manifestation of certain tendencies. Let us recall also how on the first day of the Congress Comrade Lenin, in speaking of democratic centralism, branded everybody an idiot who talks about democratic centralism, and he declared democratic centralism itself to be antiquated, obsolete, etc." (106). Sapronov defiantly stated that the development was toward the dictatorship of Party burocrats: "No matter how much you speak about electoral rights, about the dictatorship of the proletariat, about the aspirations of the Central Committee for the dictatorship of the Party, in reality this leads to the dictatorship of the Party burocrats. This is a fact. And no matter, Comrade Lenin, how erudite you are, and how ignorant and illiterate we are, all your declarations that burocratism does not exist will not avail. No words will cover it up." (44)

2. *Repressions and Exile for the Opposition*

In the acrimonious wrangle at the Congress it was brought out quite vividly that Lenin and Trotsky were employing burocratic factional method of stifling the oppositionists. The method was banishment away from the proletarian centers, sometimes into a forced exile

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

abroad. There was talk about Shliapnikov having been exiled to Norway to keep him from attending the Congress. The oppositionist Yurenev stated: "I'll permit myself to dwell on one of the methods employed by the Central Committee in leading the Party. I shall speak of that method which is elevated to a system; it is the system of exile, of banishment under various pretexts: one goes to Oslo, another one is sent to the Urals, the third one to Siberia. The Central Committee, people say, 'is playing with a human being.' The Central Committee cannot play fair. Instead, it acts as it pleases. We have read about Comrade Shliapnikov being warmly received by the Norwegian workers, but it is no secret to us why he is vacationing in Norway, and not present here at the Congress. (Laughter)." (39-40)

Other speakers talked about the Lenin-Trotsky system of exile for the oppositionists. Yurenev mentioned Siberia and the Urals as places of banishment; Yakovlev, though apparently not an oppositionist, admitted that: ". . . the Ukraine is becoming a place of exile. Comrades who for some reason are unwanted in Moscow are being sent there." (48). And even Kamenev, the burocratic boss of the Moscow district, made this remarkable admission regarding the Central Committee's attitude toward the oppositionists: "That occasionally it must apply repressive measures—that is true." (60)

Referring to the accusation that Shliapnikov was banished by the Central Committee, Lenin made a flat denial.

"Yurenev (from his seat): 'Shliapnikov told me this personally.'

"Lenin: 'I don't see how he could have told you this personally when just before departing he visited me and said he was not leaving on the instructions of the Central Committee. It would have been impermissible, of course, if the Central Committee exiled the opposition before the Congress. But when there is general talk about banishment, then I say: in that case be good enough to elect a Central Committee which could properly distribute the forces, but which would obviate the possibility of complaints. How can the forces be distributed so that everybody would be satisfied? And what is the use in talking of centralism if no such distribution will take place? And if there has been violation of principles then let us discuss it and have instances of such violation. If we exiled the representatives of the opposition than give us an instance which we shall analyze; perhaps mistakes have been made. Maybe Comrade Yurenev, who submitted a complaint to the Politburo that he was wrongly removed from the Western Front, was exiled? But the Politburo examined the question and found the action to have been correct. And no matter what kind of a Central Committee you may elect, it cannot renounce the distribution of forces.' "

With this argument Lenin again showed that his policy was for the perpetuation of the system of appointments from above, against the principle of elections from below which would have deprived the leadership of the power of exiling opponents.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lutovinov, another oppositionist, stated positively: "But I also assert that exile on the widest scale was applied to comrades in general, and to Comrade Shliapnikov in particular on several occasions." (48)

As early as the Brest days the Left Communists charged that Lenin's tactic to defeat their agitation in the Party center was to send them away from Moscow. One incident is mentioned by Lenin himself in his report to the Seventh Congress, on March 7, 1918: "When I said to one of our young friends, a would-be Left: Comrade, go to the front, see what is going on there—he took offense at this proposal. He said: 'They want to deport us so as to prevent us agitating for the great principle of a revolutionary war.' To tell the truth, in making this proposal I had no intention whatever of deporting factional enemies." (*S. W.* VII, 297)

However, why was Kollontai, a leading Left Communist and member of the Central Committee, sent during the Brest days to Sweden and Finland? Unquestionably had she then been present at the sessions of the Central Committee, where a show of democratic procedure was maintained, her speeches and vote would have been of considerable annoyance to Lenin.

As a feature of suppressing the voice of criticism there existed a glaringly one-sided method of publicizing the proceedings of the Congress. The speeches of Lenin, Trotsky and other big figures of the Party were conspicuously displayed in the pages of *Pravda*. Osinsky's speech, on the other hand, was greatly abridged, Sapronov's reduced to an abstract compressed into one brief paragraph with hardly a single word of criticism of the Central Committee in it. Thus the Party membership and the proletariat did not even suspect what was really taking place at the Ninth Congress of the Bolshevik Party.

3. *Glorification of the "Great Leader"*

The Ninth Congress gave a strong impetus to the continuous tendency of building up Lenin as a fetish, as a mystical figure in the mind of the broad masses. Many years later the Trotsky supporters wrote long essays on the Stalin "great leader" cult and singled out for castigation his birthday celebrations. However, the "great leader" cult originated not under Stalin but under Lenin. On April 10, 1920, six days after the adjournment of the Ninth Congress, the whole country celebrated Lenin's fiftieth birthday. It was also utilized as an immense political demonstration against the oppositionists. *Pravda* and other publications came out with special issues, with photographs of Lenin, with full-page articles and speeches devoted to the highlights of Lenin's life. A special brochure was issued entitled, *"Fiftieth Anniversary of Vladimit Ilyitch Ulianov-Lenin."* A brief note described the contents of the brochure: "Speeches and verses recited at the celebration in his honor, 23 of April, 1920, in the headquarters of the Moscow Committee." Leading members of the Party and eminent Soviet jour-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

nalists vied with one another in stirring flattery and excessive praise of the leader, of "that giant, Lenin." (Stalin, at the celebration of Lenin's fiftieth birthday.)

And while the Party's upper crust mirrored all the vices of the overthrown classes, the British, American and other workers outside the Bolshevik State were fed with tales like the following one: "I know now and understand how it is that the Russian workers have held on to their revolution through war, pestilence and famine. They are blessed with great leaders who have proved that power does not spoil them, who do not desire to follow the ways, customs and mode of living of the classes they have dispossessed, who, selected to serve, remain servants of the people. Together they have shared the trials, and sufferings of the common people." (George Lansbury, *Soviet Russia,* April 10, 1920, 354)

CHAPTER XIV.

THE FORERUNNER OF THE ANGLO-RUSSIAN COMMITTEE

1. *The Lenin-Trotsky Regime Suppresses Vital Information*

IN THE SPRING OF 1920 the Bolshevik State was visited by a group of British trade union leaders. The group included Robert Williams, Secretary of the Federation of Transport Workers and leader of the "Triple Alliance"—the mine, railroad, and transport workers' unions. "With the delegation have arrived also journalists of large English publications." *(Pravda,* May 16, 1920)

The group, known as the English Trade Union Delegation, was headed by Dr. Guest, outwardly a distinguished Left Liberal. Before the arrival of the delegation, the Bolshevik leaders had received information that Dr. Guest was a professional spy in the service of the British Government. Radek divulged the secret several months after the visitors departed: "When Dr. Heilers Guest, the Secretary of the English delegation, published in the *Times,* that most reactionary of all newspapers, a series of 'revelations' against Soviet Russia, he thereby confirmed, in the eyes of the English workers, the fact of which we had been warned at the time permission was given him to enter Russia, viz. that Dr. Guest was visiting Russia as the informer of the British Government. We have been, however, obliged to admit common spies who have not had the brazen-facedness to reveal themselves as such, in order to be able to welcome honest labor representatives to Russia." *(Pravda,* October 24, 1920; *Soviet Russia,* January 29, 1921)

Thus, as witnessed by Radek's open admission in the official organ of the Bolshevik Party, the Lenin-Trotsky regime *knowingly* entertained imperialist spies!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *Honoring the "Representatives of the English Workers"*

In April 1920 Arthur Henderson, leader of the Labor Party and a Minister in the British Cabinet during the imperialist war, notified the Bolshevik leaders of the desire of the British Trade Unions to send a delegation. Immediately Commissar of Foreign Affairs Chicherin radioed Henderson, outlining arrangements for the trip.

On May 14, 1920 *Pravda* heralded the arrival of the British visitors: "Representatives of the English Proletariat in Petrograd." While the Petrograd workers were starving, the guests were entertained in grand style: "In the Palace of Labor a banquet was given in honor of the English delegation. Comrade Ansilovich, opening the banquet, pointed out that the very event of the meeting of the English and Russian workers speaks for the fact that the wall which had for two years separated the toilers of Russia from the toilers of all countries has been destroyed." *(Pravda,* May 14, 1920). The people attending the banquet were not the English and Russian workers. The meeting was a gay and lively get-together of people—whom Lenin in the pre-October days had labelled "social-chauvinists," "social-patriots" and "labor agents of imperialism,"—with the burocratic functionaries of the Bolshevik State.

From Petrograd the guests proceeded by special train to Moscow. "We must greet them as our comrades," warned an editorial in *Pravda* of May 16, 1920, and went on to say: "English Comrades—desirable guests of the Moscow workers. We shall greet them tomorrow, when they arrive from Petersburg, as dear guests."

The train carrying the "dear guests" headed by Dr. Guest pulled into the station which was decorated for the occasion with red flags, garlands and bunting. The entire Bolshevik leadership of the Moscow Soviet and numerous delegations of various trade unions and of other organizations greeted the guests. A guard of honor was detailed by the Moscow garrison. The powerful Bolshevik boss of Moscow, Kamenev, with great animation said "Welcome, comrades." *(Pravda,* May 18, 1920). Thereupon the military bands thundered the *Internationale.*

Next day in honor of Mrs. Snowden, Dr. Guest, Robert Williams, A. Purcell and other "dear guests," a formal parade of the Red Army was staged in Sverdlov Square. Kamenev addressed the troops: "Comrades of the Red Army, we have brought you here to convince you that in your work you can rely on the assistance of the working class of other countries." *(Pravda,* May 19, 1920). Karl Radek had prepared the mind of the workers to accept this deception: "Today the Russian proletariat greets in the persons of the representatives of the English workers the representatives of an allied army which is coming to its aid. Tomorrow in their persons it will greet a detachment of a united international army of the revolution." *(Pravda,* May 18, 1920)

In honor of the British guests the Moscow Art Theatre presented *Cricket on the Hearth* and other "revolutionary" plays.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky also participated in the spectacular reception. Incidentally, Trotsky often played the part of a special attraction at various burocratic exhibitions and grand affairs.

In his autobiography Trotsky pretends recognizing his act to have been an error: "my 'fraternizing' with the Laborites was not only a mistake, but a political error as well." (II, 329)

Lenin left a record concerning his atttiude toward the British guests. He not only met the labor agents of British imperialism but wrote a letter about it to the British workers. And in that letter Lenin described Dr. Guest not as a spy, and the rest of the visitors not as betrayers of the workers, but as their representatives: "I had a talk with your delegates on Wednesday, May 26." (Letter to the English Workers, *C. W.* XXV, R. 261)

Needless to argue, Trotsky inwardly never regarded his fraternization with the agents of British imperialism as an error because his action was fully in line with Lenin's policy.

3. *Secret Talks in London*

The British imperialists, like the German during Brest, were able to distinguish through the maze of "revolutionary" words the cold, "practical" policy pursued by the Lenin-Trotsky Government. They had expended every effort to restore capitalism in Russia but the Russian masses had withstood the strain of Civil War and armed intervention, and temporarily at least the imperialists could do no more. Meanwhile they faced a profoundly shaken economy in Europe. The British took the lead in the attempt to stabilize European and their own home economy and adopted a new policy toward the Bolshevik State, evincing readiness to trade with it. Lenin was more than anxious to enter into such relations. Already in the Autumn of 1919 the accredited representative of the Bolshevik burocracy, Litvinov, met with an outstanding labor agent of British imperialism to talk matters over. "For the negotiations with Comrade Litvinov, England appointed as its delegate citizen O'Grady, Labor Party member of Parliament, who during the war had actively supported the war policy of the British government and the Allies, and who in 1917 had arrived in Russia with Henderson to form stronger war ties between the Provisional Government of Kerensky and the Allies." *(Yearly Report of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs to the VIII Congress of Soviets,* R. 1919-1920, 15)

On the first of June, 1920 Krasin met with Lloyd George, Lord Curzon and other high British statesmen. The "solid" Bolshevik politician, Kamenev, was rushed to Engand, and on August 5, 1920 a secret talk took place between the British Prime Minister and Kamenev and Krasin.

Thus, there was a good, practical reason why the "dear guests" lead by a British spy were entertained by Trotsky, Kamenev, Lozovsky

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and other officials of the Sovnarkom regime, and were enveloped with a moral "revolutionary" halo by Radek in the pages of *Pravda*. It was all a matter of business. While fraternizing with the labor lackeys of British imperialism in Moscow, the Lenin-Trotsky regime talked trade with and concessions to the imperialist masters in London.

4. *"Black Friday"*

On August 31, 1920 the British coal miners by an overwhelming vote decided on a strike and the leadership of the Triple Alliance comprised of the railroad, transport and mine workers issued a solemn pledge to support the miners. In October a million miners left the pits, and after some unsatisfactory offers of settlements by the capitalists, the strike situation continued into 1921. The strikes accompanying the miners' walk-out rapidly increased in number. On March 31, 1921 the leaders of the miners passed a resolution for a general strike. The moment was tense, and the Government by a royal proclamation declared Great Britain to be in "a state of emergency." The situation was definitely becoming revolutionary. *Pravda* of April 1, 1921, described it as "Not a strike but a social revolution." One of the chiefs of the Triple Alliance, Robert Williams, had been painted by the Bolshevik burocrats as a courageous fighter against the bourgeoisie. About eleven months earlier Radek had introduced him to the workers in these terms: "Robert Williams, secretary of the transport workers, leader of the Triple Alliance of the English trade unions. Robert Williams is for the Soviet idea. Robert Williams is for the direct mass struggle against capital." *(Pravda,* May 15, 1920). Immediately after Williams and other leaders of the Triple Alliance had given their pledge to support the miners, Zinoviev's organ in Petrograd spoke of "Robert Williams, who has now definitely become a Communist." *(Petrogradskaya Pravda,* Sept. 2, 1920)

The time arrived to act in support of the miners. "Then two leaders of the Triple Alliance, Thomas and Williams, announced that they had no time to disseminate the telegram calling for the start of the strike, but had just enough time to send notice about the *calling off* of the strike. And having announced the calling off of the strike, they began to discuss whether the miners were right or wrong in their demands." (M. Smith, *Class Struggle in Contemporary England,* R. 47)

This was the infamous "Black Friday"—April 15, 1921.

The day after the betrayal, the British organ of the Comintern, *The Communist,* announced its view on the chief betrayer of the British workers: "We accuse Robert Williams in that he, having been in the midst of all these secret intrigues whose aim was to force the miners to accept a reduction of wages, agreed, however, to participate in all the machinations which brought to the defeat of the strikers." (Quoted in Russian by M. Smith, 51)

Just as in the 1926 General Strike five years later, the revolution-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
ITTP_ACCEPT-

ary situation in England collapsed like a punctured baloon. The miners were left to struggle alone, and they rapidly became demoralized. This was the last betrayal by Williams and others as leaders of the Alliance, but not the first, as was well known to Lozovsky, Tomsky and other heads of the Soviet Trade Unions, and to the Bolshevik leaders in general. "The Triple Alliance had often failed before—above all, in the railway strike of 1919." *(Labour Monthly,* July 1921, 9). With the betrayal of the miners, the Triple Alliance, which had existed since 1916, expired.

Quite characteristic was the attitude of *Pravda* on the new betrayal. It was only recently that its pages had glorified Williams and other labor fakers. So *Pravda,* two days *after* the general strike had been betrayed by Thomas and Williams, lied: "Eve of General Strike." (April 17, 1921). Next day *Pravda* lied again: "Strike postponed."

The Bolshevik press was slow in releasing a few bits of truth. On April 20, five days *after* Black Friday, *Pravda,* without a single word of political enlightenment, informed the workers of the dissolution of the Triple Alliance.

The psychological ground was now laid, and the Russian burocrats could reveal another modicum of truth. On April 22, a week following Black Friday, Pravda printed a dispatch telling about "The refusal of the Triple Alliance" to stand by the miners, but in naming Williams as the betrayer *Pravda* protected itself. The previously-used Russianized spelling "Viliams" was now changed to "Ooliams," to give the illusion that a different man was involved than the one who had visited Russia about a year before. The given name "Robert" was omitted. Hardly a worker realized that this very same labor faker, "Ooliams," had been presented to the Russian proletariat by this very same *Pravda* in its May 20, 1920 issue as "one of the most outstanding leaders of the revolutionary proletarian movement in England, Comrade Robert Williams [Viliams]."

Unquestionably, Williams himself retained only pleasant memories of his visit to the "land of the Soviets" and of his meeting with Lenin, Trotsky, Kamenev and other "revolutionary" burocrats of the Bolshevik Party. He had received a token of honor from Trotsky's Deputy ". . . Skliansky, who is the acting Chairman of the Russian Revolutionary Military Council. The latter, by the way, presented me with a Military Medal of which so much has been written." (Robert Williams, *The Soviet System at Work,* 20). Williams wore a bright "Red" armor supplied him by Lenin and Trotsky which instilled confidence in the mind of the militant workers in England.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

/5.0
\CCEPT-

CHAPTER XV.

THE POLICY OF CREATING PUPPET REGIMES

1. *A Burocratic "Revolution" for Poland*

In 1920 when the Red Army advanced toward Warsaw, Lenin went to work setting up a made-in-the-Kremlin "Revolutionary Government" for Poland, although there was no revolution in Poland at the time. Lenin's contraption at first bore the name of "The Provisional Committee of Poland," and its initial act was to "depose" the Polish bourgeois government by means of a burocratic fiat: "The Provisional Revolutionary Committee of Poland: A) Deprives the hitherto existing Shliachta-bourgeois government of its power." *(Krasnaya Gazeta,* Aug. 14, 1920). But the Shliachta-bourgeois government of Pilsudsky ignored the announcement that it had been deprived of power and continued ruling Poland. A few days later the Committee changed its name to: "The Provisional Revolutionary Government of Poland." It was headed by Felix Dzerzinsky. Following in the wake of the Red Army the Dzerzinsky "Government" issued an order to Pilsudsky's troops to form Soviets: "The Provisional Revolutionary Government of Poland, a government trusted by the toiling people of the liberated regions, orders you, Polish soldiers, to elect immediately in all army units Soviets of soldiers deputies." *(Krasnaya Gazeta,* Aug. 18, 1920). This became known as "Order #1." The Dzerzinsky "Government" never lived to issue Order #2 because the Polish soldiers rallied not to him but to their bourgeois rulers, and a day later, while Stalin refused to carry out orders, the Red Army rolled back in defeat from the defenses of Warsaw. It goes without saying, had Tukhachevsky taken Warsaw, Lenin would have superimposed a ready-made appointive apparatus of his own design on a "Soviet Poland" established through a burocratic "revolution" from the top, as Stalin actually did nineteen years later in Eastern Poland which he secured through a pact with Hitler, and still later in entire Poland after the fall of the Nazis.

2. *The Lenin-Trotsky Adventure in Iran*

In June 1920 a thrilling piece of news was spread among the revolutionary workers in Russia. They were told that Communist revolution had swept to the East beyond the borders of the former Tsarist Empire. In Persia, reports stated, a Soviet Republic had been proclaimed:

"The First Toilers Republic of the East.

"In Persia there has been established Soviet Power.

"The first toilers' republic of the East is not a fairy tale, not fiction but a living fact which will soon assert itself in all the countries of the East." *(Krasnaya Gazeta,* June 17, 1920)

At the head of the new "Soviet Republic," the workers were told,

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

5.0
ACCEPT-

stood: "Chairman of the government, Comrade Mirza-Kuchuk." *(Ib.* June 10, 1920)

But there was something peculiar about the reaction of the Persian landlords and some of the aristocratic Khans toward "Comrade" Kuchuk. Reports in the Russian Bolshevik press indicated that these reactionary elements were actually overjoyed at the formation of Kuchuk's "revolutionary" regime: "The formation of the revolutionary government of Persia by Kuchuk-Khan was enthusiastically greeted not only by the poor population but also by the landlords and a section of the Khans . . ." *(Petrogradskaya Pravda,* July 15, 1920). This indeed, was fantastic! How did it happen that the Persian landlords supported a Bolshevik Government? On the other hand, how revolutionary was Kuchuk?

Kuchuk had a somewhat complicated political history behind him. A former mulla, he was a Persian nationalist with an anti-British orientation. For some time he had engaged in guerrilla activity against the pro-British Teheran government. His force was small, a band of about a hundred followers called "Forest Brothers." In 1918 he allied himself with the Kaiser's forces to fight the British. (Lenin, *C. W.* XXIII, 168). Kuchuk was very easily identifiable for what he really was by the policy he pursued when he bobbed up as the head of "The First Toilers'-Republic of the East." He revealed a pattern of demagogic promises to the toilers while in actuality working with the exploiters. This much is evident from the Bolshevik report of his concrete practices: "Kuchuk-Khan is an idealist, a revolutionist. He works with the rich classes until the time when he will drive away the Persian bourgeois government and will turn over the land to the poor population." *(Pet. Pravda,* July 15, 1920). Such was the "revolutionary" Forrest Brother, Comrade Kuchuk! And since among the leaders of the Bolshevik Party it was tacitly established that any anti-working class scoundrel could work with them, then, when he did, a Robert Williams or a Kuchuk-Khan, could be presented to the masses as a *Bolshevik.* "Kuchuk-Khan (Persian Bolshevik) intends to approach Teheran from the north-east . . ." *(Ib.* Aug. 5, 1920)

But how did it happen that the "Persian Bolshevik" who had been hiding in mountains and forests, suddenly rose to head "The first toilers republic of the East" in a situation where there were no Soviets and no proletarian revolution? An answer is given in the *Yearly Report of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs to the VIII Congress of Soviets,* 1919-1920: "In Persia the creation of the Soviet Republic in Gilan was a result of the fact that the White Guard fleet in the Caspian Sea sought refuge in the Persian port of Enzali, which thereupon was occupied by Comrade Raskolnikov on the 18 of May. The Red troops after the flight of the Anglo-Indian forces occupied Resht where on the 4 of June there was set up a Soviet Government under the chairmanship of the Persian democrat Kuchuk-Khan." (R. 72-3)

Such was the simple origin of "The First Toilers' Republic of the

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

East" headed by the "Persian Bolshevik, Comrade Kuchuk Khan"! Trotsky's forces, in pursuit of the Whites, penetrated into Iran, had picked up the nationalist adventurer Kuchuk and set him up as Chairman of a "Soviet government" to work with those landlords and capitalists who adopted the perspective against intervention in Russia. The British imperialists, while getting together with Litvinov, Kamenev and Krasin in London, were bent on keeping Russian influence out of the East. When Trotsky's forces entered Iran, the British-controlled government in Teheren appealed to the League of Nations (May 21, 1920). Two weeks later (June 4, 1920) referring to the Bolsheviks Lloyd George told Commons: "We wish to obtain guarantee that British interests during the negotiations will not be violated either in the East or at home. If these questions will be clarified the representatives of all governments will begin trade negotiations." (Ret. from Rus. *Krasnaya Gazeta,* June 8, 1920)

The "guarantees" were eventually given by Lenin and Trotsky and led to the treaty with England signed in March 1921. Meanwhile "The First Toilers Republic of the East" was overthrown at the end of July 1920—but not by the Teheran or the British forces! The *Yearly Report,* cited above, indicated by whom: "However, an attempt to introduce a Communist policy in Gilan led to no success. Between Kuchuk and the Azerbaijan Communists went on an incessant fight which ended on the 31 of July with the overthrow of the Kuchuk government in Resht."

The Lenin-Trotsky adventure in Iran with the "Persian Bolshevik" Kuchuk ended. At that stage of Bolshevik burocratic centralism the Kremlin did not possess the enormous Stalinist force to compel a perimeter group, the Arzebaijan Communists, to submit to "Comrade Kuchuk." The Arzebaijan Communist section smashed "The first toilers' Republic of the East" and set up its own "Soviet Government." But before it really got under way it was extinguished by the Iranian Communist Party which passed a resolution declaring for a bourgeois regime in Persia: "After this, Kuchuk fled into the woods. Following his withdrawal, the internal situation of the Gilan Soviet Government did not improve, and on the 22 of October, when it became clear that the Communist policy in Gilan was a failure, the Central Committee of the Iranian Communist Party adopted a resolution that for a revolution in Persia the country must pass through a bourgeois stage." *(Ib.; Soviet Russia,* January 1922, 3)

The Lenin-Trotsky regime changed its tactic and attempted to come to an understanding with pro-British Teheran, and this policy was crowned with success. On May 21, 1921 the Soviet-Iranian agreement was made public. It was based on the declaration of friendship and mutual non-intervention in internal affairs. When Lenin's envoy, Rothstein, arrived in Iran, almost the whole Iranian bourgeois press manifested extreme affection for the neighborly Bolshevik country.

With the Bolshevik burocrats the memory of the adventure with

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
ITTP_ACCEPT-

Kuchuk lingered on as a "revolutionary" event. In the Fall of 1923 they compiled *Kalendar Kommunista na 1924*. In it the Bolshevik historians recorded under the date of June 15: "Proclamation of Soviet Power in Resht (Persia) in 1920." (27). The "revolutionary" painting of the 1920-1921 Raskolnikov-Kuchuk adventure as a "progressive" affair was maintained in the "scientific" works of the Bolshevik burocracy: "The revolution of 1920-21 in Gilan, though it suffered defeat, still expedited the crash of the feudal-imperialist bloc." *(Lesser Sov. Enc.* VI, 453)

CHAPTER XVI.

EVADING THE PROBLEM OF BUROCRATISM

1. *Zinoviev Lays Down "an Anti-Burocratic" Smoke-Screen*

By 1920 the huge White Armies of Admiral Kolchak and General Denikin had been defeated and eliminated. Kolchak was executed on February 7, 1920; Denikin fled to Constantinople on April 6, 1920. In the extreme South Baron Wrangel's White forces were cornered. Peace negotiations were opened with Poland. The prolonged bloody drama produced by Lenin through his Brest "peace" policy was drawing to a close.

But as the war steadily receded, an atmosphere of internal tension enveloped all the basic elements of the Bolshevik State. The proletariat and the peasantry viewed with burning hatred the bureaucratic monopoly of power and privileges and pressed with growing determination to secure their own economic and political rights. Having been assured that burocratism was a temporary evil to be endured only because of the war, the masses, the Party membership, the lower stratum of Party functionaries, were in a threatening mood. The high burocrats were nervous. Continued disregard of the anti-burocratic sentiment would have become a self-indictment. Hence a smoke-screen of "struggle against the burocracy" had to be raised so that the transition from the military phase to the condition of "peace" could be effected without much disturbance.

At the moment no more suitable person for the job could be found than Zinoviev. He himself had castigated the Bolsheviks who seized houses and featherbeds for themselves. Moreover, Zinoviev was neither a military nor an administrative man. He was above all else a Comintern executive, and therefore could hardly be suspected of harboring burocratic lust for State power. Zinoviev opened the campaign to "combat" burocratism in August 1920. The anti-burocratic sentiments were channeled by the burocrats, as is seen from Lenin's remarks on the matter: "In August Comrade Zinoviev draws up, and the Central Committee endorses, *a letter of the Central Committee* on combatting burocracy and extending democracy. In September, the question is

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

raised at the Party conference, and the latter's decision is endorsed by the Central Committee. In December, the question of combatting burocracy is raised at the Eighth Congress of Soviets. Hence, the whole Central Committee, the whole Party and the whole workers' and peasants' republic have recognized the necessity of raising the question of burocracy and of how to combat it." *(S. W.* IX, 75)

The All-Russian Party Conference, held in September 1920, was nicknamed the "cure the Party" Conference. In a lengthy report Zinoviev portrayed with vividness and accuracy certain sinister features of the burocratic evil. Except for the concealment of the source of the evil, Zinoviev's speech sounded like a ringing call to arms. He admitted something which the workers and Party members had recognized for a long time to be the essence of "Soviet" life—*inequality:* "Further, I must touch upon the most painful question, *inequality.* We cannot avoid touching upon this; one can't throw words out of a song. We have already dealt with this question in our letter. We do not have full equality in the country, nor do we have full equality in the Party. This is a very unpleasant fact . . ." *(Pravda,* Sep. 28, 1920)

Pouring out his admissions, Zinoviev virtually acknowledged that the Lenin regime was keeping the entire body of State functionaries and Party workers in constant terror of repressions. He revealed some of the tricks the men in high places used to get rid of an unwanted person: "I know that there occur such instances when repressions take place during assignments to posts or mobilization. It has been pointed out that mobilizations are often utilized in order to get rid of an unpleasant fellow." *(Ib.).* Zinoviev wanted to impress upon his listeners that he was not attempting to conceal or minimize anything: "It is said that there are instances of transfers that look like repressions. It so happens that they not only look like repressions but actually are repressions." *(Ib.)*

Zinoviev thus openly revealed the oppressive life in the Bolshevik Party under Lenin's system of personal dictators who shifted subordinates, summarily removed them, banished them to distant places if they fell under the burocratic displeasures. And often, upon the return of the exiles from one place of banishment they would be immediately sent to another. Thus, when Shliapnikov came back from Norway, he was ordered to Archangel. The trip, he declared, was an act of banishment on the part of the Central Committee. Reference to Shlipnikov's complaint at a Moscow Region meeting is found in an article by a supporter of the Central Committee, Sheinin. *(Pravda, Dec.* 4, 1920). Zinoviev now conveyed the impression that the system of personal rule would soon be done away with by the very people who created and perpetuated it: "We must declare the most stubborn fight against a personal regime and we already have made this declaration." *(Pravda,* Sep. 28, 1920). This statement, it would seem, was in sharp contradiction with Lenin's line of individual dictators stressed by Lenin only about five months back:

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"What is necessary is individual rule, the recognition of the dictatorial powers of one man . . ." (Speech at the Third All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions, April 7, 1920. *C. W.* XXV, 144). The truth was that Lenin approved Zinoviev's demagogic concoction before it was made public: "In essence, Comrade Zinoviev's September speech was approved by the Central Committee." *(S.W.* IX, 48). Zinoviev assured his audience and the workers through the official Party press that freedom of criticism would henceforth be allowed not merely on paper but in actual practice: "Moreover, a greater freedom of criticism must be assured also in the meetings, but in order to accomplish this it is necessary that these meetings take place in life. Sad as it is, in a whole number of localities such an institution as a general meeting of Party members receded more and more into the domain of memories."

2. *The "Cure the Party" Discussion*

A wild tumult of discussion of the burocratic disease erupted in the Bolshevik Party. The oligarchy found it advisable, under these dangerous circumstances, to permit criticism in the official press. One critical appraiser stated bluntly: "Little by little there has developed a thin layer of our own Communist burocracy which imperceptibly began to move away from the masses." (Kopilov, *Pravda,* Sep. 30, 1920). Though stated in general terms this explanation was the simple truth known to every intelligent person in the Bolshevik Party. Kopilov followed up with a transparent hint that Lenin, Trotsky and the other key State figures were occupied with building their own personal power: "Instead of self-activity within the Party, instead of the work of training the members in preparation for their active participation in the Soviet and Party building, the leaders began to occupy themselves with one problem, the chief problem insofar as they were concerned: the creation of their own solid and obedient majority which would serve as a screen for their factually irresponsible activity. In appointing functionaries the main attention has been given not to the capabilities of this or that comrade in the given branch of industry but to his capacity to be a docile manikin, a blind tool in the hands of the comrades standing above." *(Ib.)*

Much truth and much bitterness was poured out by Kopilov: "The functionaries, who are appointed to this or that post for services which are known to anybody but not to the organization, in their turn hastened to surround themselves with an element which is obedient to them personally and which disorganizes instead of tightening up the work. The Party cannot reconcile itself to such a situation. A healthy reaction against this corroding tactic, speaking mildly, pursued by the comrades who became burocratized beyond measure, gave birth to the division of 'tops' and 'bottoms.' Against this division, which contradicts all the basic principles of our Party,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

we must conduct the most resolute struggle. The unhealthy setting created by the comrades who stand at some point of power, factual exile of those who voice opposition, exile under the pretext of all sorts of mobilizations, have rendered the situation still more acute." Although an obscure Party member, Kopilov was no superficial observer: "Individual comrades holding high administrative posts started aiming at the concentration of full power in their hands both within the Party and the Soviets."

An exceptionally daring opposition speaker at the September 1920 Party Conference was Lutovinov. He actually made a veiled proposal to remove Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and other oligarchs of the Bolshevik Party from administrative power and limit their activity to political guidance! Furthermore he demanded that the rights of Party members be reestablished. *Pravda* of September 30, 1920 reported: "In conclusion Lutovinov introduces a number of proposals on transforming the Central Committee from an administrative organ into one of guidance, on reestablishing the Party members in their rights, etc." Lutovinov's proposal in the eyes of the Sovnarkom usurpers constituted a serious threat to their control, and Zinoviev, in reply, resorted to a Thermidorian amalgam to discredit Lutovinov: "The formula of transforming the Central Committee of our Party from being administrative into being a guide is devoid of content. Point 2. Reestablishing Party members in their rights, etc. Comrades, let comrade Lutovinov take no offense; but this point, as well as some other points, sounds Left SR'ist." *(Ib.)*

Other oppositionists asked: "Is it possible that so soon there is revealing itself the tendency of intoxication with power?" (Kuretov, *Pravda*, Oct. 6, 1920). The "so soon" had been going on since the invention of the Sovnarkom.

After the Party Conference adjourned, the discussion was transferred to the Eighth Congress of the Soviets. Here Zinoviev admitted that the elective method was non-existent in the Sovnarkom's domain and gave the oft-repeated hypocritical promise to carry out the proletarian-democratic program of 1917: "When we are asked what do we understand by workers' and peasants' democracy—says Comrade Zinoviev, concluding his speech,—I say nothing else except what we understood about it in 1917. We must reestablish the elective method of workers' and peasants' democracy." *(Pravda*, Dec. 30, 1920). To build up confidence in the Sovnarkom regime, Zinoviev pretended to agree with the oppositionists that the system of appointments must go: "I—says Comrade Zinoviev concerning 'appointees'—do not deny the need of abolishing this system, but this has become possible only now when we have new local cadre functionaries who will be able to carry out the directives of the center." On the other hand, Lenin at the Ninth Congress of the Bolshevik Party (March 1920), had been quite crude when he attacked "All these outcries against appointments, all this old and dangerous rubbish."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3. *Lenin's Word in the Discussion*

It was during the Eighth Congress of Soviets that the Workers Opposition led by Shliapnikov, Kollontai, Lutovinov and others fully crystallized. Soon after, it issued the demand: "Election method all down the line, with the elimination of the system of appointment and proxies, and the strengthening of responsibility before the lower units of the Party." *(Pravda,* Jan. 25, 1921). The Workers Opposition further demanded: "Guarantee of freedom and criticism of opinion—the right not only of free discussions but also of material subsidy to assure the publication of the literature of inner-Party tendencies." On the same day that the Workers Opposition presented what was virtually Lenin's 1917 rejection of methods of appointment, Lenin declared with a cynical note of finality: "As long as we, the Central Committee of the Party, and the whole Party, administer, i.e. administer the state, we shall never renounce, nor can we renounce, 'shaking up,' i.e. removing, replacing, appointing, dismissing, etc." *(S. W.* IX, 71)

As to the problem of burocratism, it was clear that in his own mind Lenin resolved that the cancer was there to stay. On that day, January 25, 1921, he stated: "The struggle against burocratism will take decades. This is the most difficult struggle and anyone who will tell you that we can at once free ourselves of burocratism if we adopt anti-burocratic platforms is simply a charlatan, a lover of excellent words." (Speech at the Second Congress of mineworkers, XXVI, R. 99). But it was just such an anti-burocratic platform that Lenin had presented to the Russian workers in 1917; after establishing himself as the head of the Sovnarkom Lenin preferred not to recall this fact.

It is obvious that Lenin, fully aware of the fact that he reneged on all the proletarian-democratic obligations he had made to the masses in the 1917 pre-October era, was determined to perpetuate his burocratic-appointment regime of personal dictatorial power and to curb further the greatly curtailed "rights" of the unenlightened membership of the Bolshevik Party.

CHAPTER XVII.

TROTSKY'S SORTIE AGAINST LENIN

1. *The Crisis of Distribution of Power*

With the passing of the military struggle, profound changes were occurring in the relative weight of authority of various high burocrats. Lenin, of course, remained administratively supreme. But Trotsky's virtually unlimited dictatorial war-time powers were automatically coming to an end. The huge Army was to be demobilized and the center of activity to be shifted from the military field to that of economy. Trotsky was confronted with the prospect

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of becoming something of a figurehead—illustrious, celebrated, almost legendary, but with considerably curtailed power. In contrast, Stalin's power as the head of the Rabkrin and of other State and Party bodies, and the power of all the high burocrats in the industrial sphere was on the rise. Sufficiently far-sighted, Trotsky pondered over the problem of shifting his authority to the economic domain. The smoke-screen of the discussion on burocratism aided him in pursuing his own scheme in the general crisis. He chose for his operations a vital branch of the economy and closely linked with the War Department, the transport workers union called the Cectran.

Emboldened by his popularity resulting from the victorious conclusion of the Civil War, Trotsky imagined it would be a simple matter, using the Cectran as a lever, to gain control of the entire trade union machinery of the State and become a powerful industrial dictator. All that was required was to elbow Lenin's men, Tomsky and Lozovsky, out of control and replace them with his own men. Eastman tells of Trotsky's idea to "strengthen" the trade unions: "He proposed also to strengthen the trade unions by introducing into their administration a selected body of the ablest executives who had been developed in the organization of the army." *(Since Lenin Died,* 135)

Trotsky proceeded cautiously. The relations among the Party oligarchs had by now reached the stage where every intrigue for personal aggrandizement required an appropriate target and scape-goat. Trotsky's specific target was the Worker Opposition which was very popular in the trade unions. Concealing his real intent he approached Lenin and presented the idea of tearing the ground from under the feet of the Kollontai-Shliapnikov-Lutovinov group. Trotsky told the story at the Tenth Congress of the Party in March 1921: "When I first presented my point of view in the Central Committee, I said: 'We have a Workers Opposition which in a high degree is nursed by the indefinite position of the trade unions in the Workers State. Because of this the Workers Opposition transforms the trade unions everywhere into its political forum, somewhat similar to the situation when the liquidators, under the guise of neutrality, were transforming the trade unions into their political party. It is necessary—said I—to pose in a practical way the question 'of the role of the trade unions in production, and on this business-like basis we shall capture the best elements of the Workers Opposition.' Thus, approximately did I speak. Lenin said: 'I think Trotsky is right; let him submit theses on this point.' " *(Sten. Rep.* 216)

Before submitting his theses, Trotsky delivered a speech early in November 1920 at the Fifth All-Russian Conference of Trade Unions, in which be boldly introduced the proposal to change the composition of the leading trade union personnel. Trotsky's underlying motive was not yet obvious to Lenin. But Tomsky, a key trade union burocrat, sensed the danger to himself and reacted with a violent passion. Lenin wrote in an article "The Party Crisis": "Trotsky utters the 'winged

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

word' about 'Shaking up' the trade unions. Tomsky argues very heatedly. The majority of the members of the Central Committee are noncommittal." *(S. W.* IX, 29). However, a few days later, when Trotsky submitted his theses, Lenin clearly saw through his burocratic plot. Unquestionably, Lenin grew alarmed. He must have recalled the rumors about Trotsky picking men against him, and realized that Trotsky could not be allowed to get out of hand. Lenin decided to teach Trotsky a lesson in burocratic centralism. No burocrat, not even Lenin's favorite, Stalin, could be permitted to hatch grandiose intrigues for snatching power independently and over the authority of Lenin himself. In the above-mentioned article Lenin recorded: "Second stage. The plenum of the Central Committee of November 9. Trotsky submits a 'rough draft of theses': 'The Trade Unions and Their Future Role,' which advocate the 'shaking up' policy *concealed,* or embellished, by arguments about the 'severe crisis' in the trade unions and about new tasks and methods. Tomsky, strongly supported by Lenin, considers that it is precisely the 'shaking up' that is the centre of gravity of the whole controversy in view of the irregularities and burocratic excesses of the Cectran."

2. *Lenin Gags Trotsky*

Lenin now handled Trotsky with a coarseness that set a new record in the suppression of divergent opinion and freedom of speech in the Bolshevik Party. Trotsky, the brilliant luminary of the October Revolution and the Civil War, the man who was second only to Lenin himself, was *forbidden* to speak to the Party membership! Even after Lenin's death, under the dictatorship of Stalin, the Central Committee never took decisions enjoining Trotsky, when he was still a member of the Party, from speaking. But under Lenin the Central Committee muzzled Trotsky, according to Trotsky's own testimony at the Tenth Congress: "In November the Central Committee adopted a decision which enjoined me from discussion. I said: 'Your decision is false, I am a member of the Party like every other member, and you cannot forbid me to speak after you have announced freedom of discussion.' " *(S. R.* 215).

If a towering figure like Trotsky could be gagged, it is understandable how the personal dictator system which Lenin inflicted on the masses operated behind the deceptive facade of "democratic" phrases. The tyranny exercised through appointed dictators had been graphically described by Lutovinov at the "Cure the Party" Conference only a few weeks before the decision to silence Trotsky. "These persons who, armed with the broadest powers, are imposed upon localities through appointment by the Central Committee, treat people the way a cook does potatoes." *(Pravda,* Sep. 30, 1920)

Lenin temporarily restrained Trotsky's freedom of speech to make him feel who was master. Lenin's next step was to put a disciplinary

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

bridle on Trotsky by setting up a Trade Union Commission and "electing" Trotsky to it so that he could be governed by a mechanical majority. Trotsky bolted. According to Lenin, Trotsky advanced the reason that he would not work with oppositionists. Lenin used strong words in attacking Trotsky for thwarting the plan to shackle him with a commission: "A commission is set up, the names of the members are published. Trotsky resigns from the Commission, disrupts it, refuses to work. Why? Only one reason is given: Lutovinov sometimes plays at opposition. It is true Osinsky does so as well. To speak quite frankly, this is not a pleasant game. But is that an argument? Osinsky carries out the seed campaign excellently. Trotsky should have worked with him in spite of his 'opposition campaign'; and methods like disrupting a commission are bureaucratic, non-Soviet, non-Socialist, incorrect and politically harmful." ("Trade Unions and Mistakes of Trotsky," *S. W.* IX, 21)

However, Trotsky gave an altogether different reason for his refusal to stay "elected" to the Lenin-picked Commission: "On the Central Committee I stated clearly why I would not go on to the Commission: until I am permitted, equally with all other comrades, to discuss these questions in their full scope in the Party press I expect nothing useful from this cloister discussion of these questions, and hence from work on the commission." (Quoted by Lenin, 58)

The crisis mounted as Trotsky rebelled against Lenin's authority and demanded freedom to put out his theses to the Party. Lenin for a time maintained the ban, while his adjutants planned some surgical operations on the Cectran to reduce Trotsky's grip on that union.

3. *Lenin Charges Trotsky with Hatching Burocratic Projects*

Trotsky's irreconcilability forced the Central Committee to maneuvers in the open. "On December 24, the Central Committee permitted free discussion." (31). Trotsky's platform had been set up in type, and the day after the Central Committee granted the permission, his pamphlet was printed. Tomsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev and other Leninists met Trotsky's pamphlet with a furious verbal barrage. Lenin himself joined the fray declaring that Trotsky's pamphlet contained trick words to conceal the true meaning of the "shake-up" maneuver: "The whole contents of the pamphlet from beginning to end are thoroughly permeated with the 'shaking up' spirit. The pamphlet *fails* to indicate any 'new' 'tasks and methods' that were to embellish or conceal or justify 'shaking up', if we leave out of account the intellectual trick words." *(Ib.)*

In the controversy the burocrats employed veiled language, like cautious thieves who fall out in public. Zinoviev's paper shaped its attack on Trotsky in the form of very pointed questions: "Is it an accident that of all the 23 industrial trade unions existing in Soviet Russia only one—the union of transport workers where Comrade

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky and his associates performed their experiments, is brought almost to the verge of a split? Is it an accident that the Cectran, directed by comrade Trotsky, has counterposed itself to the rest of the all-union organization of Soviet Russia? Is it an accident that Comrade Trotsky and his associates made an attempt to transform the Cectran into a second center of the trade union movement?" ("Reply of Petrograd organization to Comrade Trotsky," *Pet. Pravda,* Jan. 18, 1921)

Those in the know understood Trotsky's maneuver, yet nobody could openly state the true purpose behind it. In dealing with Trotsky's recalcitrance Lenin found himself in a contradictory position. His own personal power was based on the system of appointing and removing functionaries from above. But now when Trotsky struck out on his own, Lenin pretended to disapprove of such a system: "From beginning to end the whole of Comrade Trotsky's pamphlet-platform is thoroughly permeated precisely with the spirit of the 'shaking up from above' policy." *(S. W.* IX, 46). "The burocratic project-hatching character of what Comrade Trotsky has written in his theses *is already proved."* (60)

4. *Trotsky's Defeat*

Seeing no alternative but to meet Trotsky on trade-union grounds, the Leninists adopted a trade union platform of their own. It consisted of a leaflet-theses originally written by Rudzutak, a secondary figure, for the Fifth All-Russian Conference of Trade Unions held November 2-6, 1920, some time before Trotsky presented his rough draft to the Central Committee. No one had taken particular note of Rudzutak's leaflet, and normally it would have been gathering dust. But Trotsky's transgression of the unwritten laws of burocratic centralism compelled Lenin to search through the trade union material at hand for a suitable instrument against him. That the adoption of Rudzutak's theses as a platform by ten leading Bolshevik burocrats was a diplomatic trick on Lenin's part was quite clear to Trotsky: "Lenin glanced at them from a diplomatic angle, when he required a lightning rod, he said: here you have theses—and no better ones are needed—against both Cectran and Trotsky." *(Pravda,* Jan. 21, 1921)

Thus, both Lenin and Trotsky accused each other of dishonest tactics.

The process of bringing Trotsky back to "burocratic sanity" was complicated by Bukharin who formed a "buffer" group and gave indirect aid to Trotsky. Lenin's leading assistants in the fray were three outstanding burocrats of the Central Committee: Stalin, vindictive, jealous of Trotsky's prestige, corrupt to the marrow; the practiced demagogue Zinoviev; and the smooth Kamenev. While the verbal battle raged, Zinoviev, by way of support for the "proletarian" cause, "shook up" the Petrograd section of the Cectran, replacing Trotsky's

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

henchmen with henchmen of the Leninist "Ten." Taking account of Trotsky's immense popularity, Lenin's assistants secretly used Trotsky's anti-Bolshevik past as a means of discrediting him! "At the time of our two months' argument on the trade union question (Winter 1920-21) Stalin and Zinoviev had again attempted to put into circulation references to the non-Bolshevik past of Trotsky." *(Sup. Test. of Lenin,* 14)

What is the meaning of the words "again attempted"? Evidently, Stalin, Zinoviev and others had used this tactic against Trotsky before, probably during the Stalin-Voroshilov Tsaritsin intrigue. And now they were at it again. Was Lenin involved in this factional campaign? Was he ignorant of it? At the end of 1922 he indicated that he was fully aware of this method his supporters employed to fight Trotsky. In the Testament there is a definite warning not to use Trotsky's former non-Bolshevism against him. This warning could come only as a result of concrete experience in the past. Thus, the seeds of "Trotskyism" were sown under Lenin and with his knowledge.

But how did Trotsky's supporters react to the anti-Trotskyist intrigue of Lenin's hatchetmen? Exactly as Trotsky himself later reacted to the Trio's campaign in 1923-1924 when he hit back at Zinoviev and Kamenev with the *Lessons of October!* Trotsky testifies: "In answer to this, the less restrained leaders of the opposite camp had reminded Zinoviev of his conduct during the period of the October insurrection." *(Ib.)*

Defeated, Trotsky for a moment tottered. In the new "elections" to the Central Committee at the Tenth Congress he gathered fewer votes than Stalin and even fell below Molotov and Kalinin. Never again did Trotsky defy the head of the burocratic machine—Lenin, or Stalin; he had learned his lesson well.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE ANTI-LENIN WORKERS OPPOSITION IN THE BOLSHEVIK PARTY

1. *The Trade Unions and Factory Committees*

WHEN TROTSKY insisted on carrying his own burocratic fight beyond the confines of the ruling circle he committed a serious indiscretion insofar as the stability of the burocratic system was concerned. The publication of his theses opened the floodgates of inner-Party oppositional expression. The betrayal of the 1917 pledges by the top leadership, conspiracies, deception and burocratic arrogance had caused such a vast accumulation of protest and indignation among the workers and minor functionaries that the conflict between the "bottom" and the "top" fairly shook the Party. Interest-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ingly enough, the trade union ground chosen by Trotsky for his burocratic "shaking up" plot was ideally fitted for the general oppositional offensive. The vocal representatives of the opposition elements in the Bolshevik Party could find no broader organized proletarian field than the trade unions which had eight and a half million members.

To form a clear view of the fight of the opposition it is necessary to survey in brief the fate of the trade unions under the Lenin regime before and after the fight. In 1917 the trade unions and the factory and shop committees performed a key function in the struggle of the workers against the bourgeoisie. Following the October Revolution the trade unions served as the chief instrument in obtaining supplies for the Bolshevik State. Lenin remarked at the Ninth Congress of the Party: "Do not let us fool ourselves; the trade unions bore the whole brunt of the fight when the state needed help on food work." (*S. W.* VIII, 93)

To the burocracy it was of supreme importance to eliminate the democratically elected factory committees and to prevent the trade union representatives from meddling with the individual dictators appointed from above by the Supreme Council of National Economy. The burocratic strangulation of the trade unions, as in the cases of the Soviets and of the Bolshevik Party, was accomplished under the guise of suggesting the management of industry be turned over to them. Speaking at the Second All-Russian Trade Union Congress on January 20, 1919 Lenin stated: "It is inevitable that the trade unions be governmentalized; it is inevitable that they be fused with the organs of state power; it is inevitable that the work of building up large-scale industry be entrusted entirely to them" (*C. W.* XXIII, 514). But Lenin's practice in the trade unions guided their development in the opposite direction from his *words,* and some years later Lozovsky indicated: "The governmentalization of the trade unions, or, the placing of the management of economy into the hands of the trade unions in practice proved to be unrealizable." (*Narodnoye Khoziastvo,* Oct. 1922, 47)

What happened in the period between Lenin's and Lozovsky's statement? There was the indisputable fact that in the first year after October, the trade unions, though hampered by the sabotaging specialists, did perform the difficult task of managing large sections of economy. Milutin, one of the signers of the Platform of the Ten, wrote: "Life completely confirmed the correctness of the line of basing the management of economy on the trade unions." (*Ib.* Apr. 1919, 4). But the growth of the burocratic power of the Supreme Council of National Economy (S.C.N.E.) steadily reduced the relative importance of the trade union management. This process was covered up with specious phrases about creating workers' control through the trade unions. Thus, the resolution adopted by the second congress of the S.C.N.E. in March 1919 declared: "The correct solution of the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

question of organizing workers control is to transfer it into the hands of the trade unions. The present apparatus of government control must not only refrain from taking upon itself independent organization of control over production but this apparatus must gradually be substituted with the apparatus of control by workers' organizations. The functions of control of the Chief Committees and Centers as well as of the departments of the Supreme Soviets of National Economy must be turned over to the corresponding production unions." *(Ib.* March 1919)

But while the workers were being soothed with all these promising words, the direct opposite was being done in reality. The period of actual workers' control is to be measured not in years but in *weeks.* It was limited to a few days before October 1917 and a few weeks after. Many years later Trotsky admitted that "the stage of the workers' control did not develop." *(What Next,* 171)

In April 1920 at the Ninth Congress of the Party a legal aspect was lent to the policy of stifling the trade unions. A note to Lenin's *Works* gives the story: "The decision on Workers Control adopted by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee on November 14, 1917, served as a powerful weapon in the struggle against the capitalists. To the degree the nationalization was being carried out in 1918-1919 the control was losing its significance. In April 1920 the IX Congress of the R.C.P. expressed itself in favor of individual management of industry. In October 1921 the All-Russian Central Executive Committee published a decree on the inviolability of commercial secrets and forbade the demand, outside the court organs, for opening the books of private and rented enterprises." (XIV, Pt. 2, R. 515). Whereas originally the SCNE had simply been an instrument subordinated to the trade unions, it gradually separated itself from them and became an instrument of the topmost Party burocrats. By the end of 1922 it passed fully under Stalin's control as did all the other State departments: "The relations between the trade unions and the Supreme Council of National Economy began its existence as an elective organ, organized by the Trade Unions and subordinated to them. It went through the stage of close cooperation and common organization of managing centers, and now exists parallel with the Trade Unions. It ceased to be an elective organ, and is in essence the Commissariat of Industry, and, like all the Commissariats, is being constructed from the top downwards." (Lozovsky, *Narodnoye Khoziastvo,* Oct. 1922, 45)

On March 29, 1920, Lenin, at the Ninth Congress, just before it adopted a resolution in support of his policy of individual managers of industry, sought to instill *hatred* toward the few remnants of the 1917-1918 democratic practices in the trade unions: "We must rise higher, displaying energy and unanimity of will. Tremendous difficulties face the trade unions. We must see to it that they approach

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

this task in a spirit of hostility to the survivals of this famous democracy." *(S. W.* VIII, 92)

The factory committees, the immediate organs of workers control, were emasculated when the Ninth Congress of the Party passed the decision that "A factory committee must not interfere in the sphere of direction of an enterprise." Its function became merely that of an auxiliary to the individual dictator-manager. In 1920 Zinoviev gave a brief review of the life of the factory committees: "The factory committees have undergone in the last years a great evolution. Their role as an important political crystallization point prior to the February Revolution is well known. Before the February and October Revolutions they performed the role of those first workers nuclei which in action proceeded to organize control over production. After the October Revolution they served as the initial organizational base in carrying out the nationalization of economy. Out of their midst came forth a whole layer of those best workers who were integrated into the administration of the nationalized enterprises and into our glavkoms and centers. When the All-Russian Unification of the factory committees was abolished their role changed sharply. They became the nuclei of the trade unions and remain so up to this moment. They may participate in the organization of production only to that extent and in that form in which the trade unions are participating." *(Kommunistichesky Int.* #9, 1920, 1251). And to what extent could the trade unions participate in the organization of production? The Ninth Congress imposed on the trade unions the prohibition: "Do not interfere in the directing of enterprises." *(S. R.* 385)

The economic power which the factory committees had wielded in the October 1917 period had been wrested from them by Lenin. This burocratic robbery was carried out under the usual protective "revolutionary" promises. Several months after October the following was outlined: "Workers control over nationalized enterprises will be enacted through the factory-shop committees." (Resolution of the Supreme Council of National Economy, March 3, 1918). And then Lenin turned the control over to individual bosses-dictators, responsible only to the highest Party burocrats. The Eleventh Congress of the Party, the last Leninist Congress (March-April 1922), completed the handing the control of economy to the appointed individual directors. Enumerating several conditions, the Resolution of the Congress declared: "Every direct interference of the trade unions in the management of enterprises, under these conditions, must be recognized as absolutely injurious and impermissible." (Lenin, XXVII, R. 452)

Thus Lenin at the Eleventh Congress completed the emancipation of the burocrats from interference by the shop committees and trade unions in the domain of manufacture and distribution of products.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *The Workers Opposition Opens the Offensive*

The turmoil released by Trotsky resulted in the most unique, most bitter and most outstanding internal struggle in the history of the Bolshevik Party. The Trotsky and the Bukharin groups, basically concerned over the safety of the burocratic system, had to join Lenin in attacking the Workers Opposition. In its bold and passionate fight, the Workers Opposition used as one of its strongest weapons a pamphlet, *The Workers Opposition in the Russian Communist Party,* by Alexandra Kollontai. The work suffered from numerous political errors, but it contained a powerful indictment of the Lenin-Trotsky regime for its burocratic infidelity to the cause of the proletariat. Kollontai posed the problem of uprooting the burocracy in a very direct way: "In order to do away with the burocracy that is finding its shelter in the Soviet institutions, *we must first of all get rid of all burocracy in the party itself.*" (37). The Party leadership, she charged, not only did not act to destroy the burocracy, but "our party leaders all of a sudden appear in the role of defenders and knights of burocracy." (35)

And she clearly grasped that the underlying cause of the Central Committee maneuver carried out by Zinoviev was the profound discontent among the revolutionary workers in the Party: "Within its ranks a ferment was at work; signifying that the 'lower' elements demand freedom of criticism, loudly proclaiming that burocracy strangles them, leaves no freedom for activity, or for manifestation of initiative. The leaders of the party understood this undercurrent and through comrade Zinoviev made many verbal promises as to freedom of criticism, widening of the scope of self-activity for the masses, persecution of leaders deviating from the principles of democracy, etc. A great deal was said, and said well; but from words to deeds there is a considerable distance. The September Conference, together with Comrade Zinoviev's much promising speech, has changed nothing either in the party or in the life of the masses." (8)

To make it clear that Trotsky's stand on the unions, as well as Bukharin's, did not essentially differ from the position of the Lenin Ten, she stressed the basic feature that bound the top burocrats together: "It is, after all, significant that all the theses written by the party leaders coincide in one essential feature: for the present we shall not give control over the production to the trade unions; for the present we 'shall wait.' It is also true that Trotsky, Lenin, Zinoviev and Bukahrin's points of view differ in stating the reason—why the workers should not be entrusted with running the industries just at present, but they all unanimously agree that just at the present time the management over the production must be carried on *over the workers heads* by means of a burocratic system inherited from the past. On this point all the leaders of our party are in complete accord." (23)

The Bolshevik historians found Lenin's copy of Kollontai's pam-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

phlet in which he made numerous notes. According to these notes, the Workers Opposition charged Lenin with virtually enslaving the Russian workers. Lenin paraphrased the Opposition's words as follows: " . . . millions of Russian proletarians are dragging a *penal-servitude, shamefully-miserable existence in the Soviet toilers Russia.*" *(Leninsky Sb.* XX, 35)

The Kollontai-Shliapnikov Workers Opposition could have immensely strengthened their attack on the Sovnarkom usurpers had they done some research in Lenin's 1917 writings. On the question of burocratic method of management of economy and immediate transfer of control to the proletariat Lenin had declared: "The workers must sweep aside all high-sounding phrases, promises, declarations, projects evolved in the centre by bureaucrats ready every minute to apply themselves to drawing up the most effective plans, regulations, statutes, rules. Down with all this lying! Down with all this fracas of bureaucratic and bourgeois project-mongering that has collapsed everywhere with a crash. Down with this habit of procrastination! The workers must demand the immediate establishment of actual control, to be exercised only by the workers themselves." *(Pravda,* May 29-30, 1917; XIV, R. Pt I, 196; *C. W.,* XX, B. II, 86-87)

In 1917 Lenin made it clear in what State he meant to establish workers control—not in a bourgeois State: "When we say 'workers control,' placing this slogan *side by side* with the dictatorship of the proletariat, and always after it, we thus make clear what State we have in mind." *(Education,* R. Oct. 1917; C. W. XXI, B. II, 28)

The workers in 1917, flocking by the millions to the support of the Bolshevik leadership, could have never visualized this apparently honest leadership, after the overthrow of the capitalists and landlords, resorting to demagogy, high-sounding phrases and plain lying in order *not* to translate into practice Lenin's 1917 agitational words on workers control.

3. *The Strength of the Workers Opposition*

Considering that the Workers Opposition crystallyzed barely three months before the Tenth Congress, that it carried on its propaganda under persecution and repression, that it was hampered by lack of means to express its position as compared with the immense publicity machine at the disposal of the Ten, the Workers Opposition showed a phenomenal strength. At the Moscow Province Conference of the R.C.P., after Kamenev, the Bolshevik boss of the district, already an ally of Stalin in the secretly-formed Trio, had presented the program of the Ten, the Workers Opposition mustered forty-five votes against 217 for the Ten. In the Communist fractions of the Second All-Russian Congress of Miners, as against 137 for the Ten the Workers Opposition got 62. Away from the well-controlled burocratic Centers the strength of the Workers Opposition was even greater. In some places it actually

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

secured the backing of a majority of the Party membership. Thus, Smilga, a strong supporter of the Central Committee, disclosed at the Tenth Congress that the Samara section of the Party had gone over to the Workers Opposition. The Stalinist historian, N. Popov, writes: "The 'Workers Opposition' was supported by the majority votes of two such proletarian organizations as the Communist Party of the Bolsheviks of the Ukraine in Nikolaiev and Lugansk. In Kharkov the resolution of the 'Workers Opposition' was adopted at the joint meeting of the large industrial units of the Petinsk region." *(Sketches on the History of the Communist Party of the Ukraine,* R. 267-8). In some State institutions the Workers Opposition fairly overwhelmed the supporters of Lenin as well as those of Trotsky. Alexander Barmin, former Stalin burocrat, volunteer in the Red Army (1919) and student in the Bolshevik Military College (1920-21), testifies: "When the moment for voting came, out of the 300 Communist pupils of the College, 13 sided with Trotsky, 32 with Lenin and 250 with Kollontai." *(Memoirs of a Soviet Diplomat,* 117)

About a month before the Tenth Congress the official press recorded the growing strength of the Workers Opposition: "The 'Workers Opposition' (Shliapnikov group), however, is growing stronger. In some places, as a rival of the Platform of the Ten it has pushed the Trotsky group into the background." *(Izvestia,* Feb. 13, 1921)

It is impossible to ascertain the exact numerical strength of the Workers Opposition. The supporters of the Central Committee resorted to every possible means to make the number of the adherents of Kollontai and Shliapnikov seem smaller than it really was. That it was very large can be gathered from Smilga's veiled proposal to the Tenth Congress to expell 50 to 60 thousand Party members and thus "have a numerically smaller Party, but one more strongly welded together." *(Sten. Rep.* 171)

4. *Burocratic Tricks in Printing Opposition Literature*

Kollontai's pamphlet was printed by the State publishing department, and, according to the figure marked on the cover, the issue numbered one million five hundred thousand copies. This would mean that the pamphlet was distributed far and wide, reaching the 732,521 members of the Party and hundreds of thousands of trade union and other workers. But how could such freedom of criticism harmonize with the contents of the pamphlet which expressly charged the Lenin leadership with the suppression of criticism? An illuminating reply to this seeming enigma is contained in the disclosure made by Kollontai at the Tenth Congress: "On the cover of the pamphlet the 'Workers Opposition' issued by the State publishing department it is stated that the number of copies printed is one million five hundred thousand. In other words there were added three zeros which give the impression that the pamphlet the 'Workers Opposition' has been

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

widely circulated, far greater than the circulation of any official pamphlets. In reality the pamphlet was printed only in 1,500 copies and printed with hindrances at that." (54)

While facilitating the printing of an enormous quantity of the demagogic writings of Zinoviev, Kamenev, and other members and supporters of the Central Committee, Lenin put up difficulties for the Workers Opposition. By limiting the edition of Kollontai's pamphlet to fifteen hundred copies he prevented full coverage of even the members of the Workers Opposition themselves. This fact alone corroborated the charge that the ruling burocrats stifled criticism in the Bolshevik Party.

The hope for workers' control lived primarily among the factory workers, both Communist and non-Partyites. Every sacrifice, every step of retreat before the specialists was wrung from the workers by the Sovnarkom regime on the plea of war exigency. The thesis, No workers' control without peace was accepted in the trade unions, but at the same time it was stressed, No peace without the establishment of workers' control. The approaching conclusion of the Civil War in the Fall of 1920 created a great stir in the trade unions. Inevitably, therefore, the Party leadership, for the most cogent burocratic reasons, had for sometime pursued a policy of smothering the unions. The Workers Opposition accompanied its exposures at the Tenth Congress with this interesting revelation: "A glaring illustration of the situation in which the trade unions find themselves is provided by the report on the condition of the trade union press. Up to the present the trade unions have neither a printing establishment nor paper. The periodicals of the big trade unions appear several months late. The State publishing house hardly accepts printing jobs from the trade unions." *(S. R.* 360)

5. *The Battle of the Tenth Congress*

The Tenth Congress of the R.C.P. opened on March 8, 1921. The atmosphere was tense. Lenin's keynote address contained a distinct threat to suppress the discussion: "The controversial atmosphere is becoming extremely dangerous, it is becoming a positive menace to the dictatorship of the proletariat." *(S. W.* IX, 92). Since the agitation of the Workers Opposition gave a vocal expression to the sentiment of the masses, Lenin found it advisable to admit that the burocratic disease was a fact: "The ulcer of burocracy undoubtedly exists; it is admitted, and a real struggle must be waged against it." (105). And he cynically asserted that the workers could get rid of the burocratic ulcer by heeding the instructions of Stalin's Commissariat of Workers and Peasants' Inspection, the Rabkrin! "This sore can be removed only by the unity of the toilers, by the toilers not only being able to welcome the decrees of the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection . . . by being able, through the Workers' and Peasants' Inspection, to exer-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cise their rights, which at present is not the case, not only in the villages, but even in the towns, and even in the capital cities! Often they are not able to exercise their rights even where the loudest protests are made against burocracy. It is extremely necessary to pay attention to this." (105)

Stalin had been in control of the Commissariat of Inspection for nearly two years and had made the most of his opportunities. "Having become in 1919 the head of the People's Commissariat of Inspection, Stalin gradually transformed it into an instrument of favoritism and intrigues." *(Stalin,* 373). It was only in 1923, when Lenin, sensing that Stalin had become the factual wielder of the Sovnarkom and was aiming still higher, that he completely reversed himself on the question of the Rabkrin and wrote against his former favorite: "Everybody knows that a more badly organized institution than our Workers' and Peasants' Inspection does not exist, and that under present conditions nothing can be expected from this commissariat." *(S. W.* IX, 390)

In the discussion at the Tenth Congress Lenin admitted that he and his associates in power had not introduced "sufficient" proletarian democracy: "When we are told that we have not carried out democratization to a sufficient degree, then our reply is: this is absolutely true. Yes, we have not carried it out sufficiently." *(Sten. Rep.* 61)

The chief demagogue of the September 1920 "cure the Party" conference, Zinoviev, used the same tactic of frank acknowledgements to disarm or at least weaken the oppositionists. Knowing very well that the Party burocracy was enjoying relative luxury while the workers, under the system of inequality which had been consciously legalized by Lenin in the Spring of 1918, were in the depth of misery, Zinoviev confirmed the statements of one of the leaders of the Workers Opposition: "When Comrade Kutuzov says that we have burocratism, that our workers sleep on bare boards and that we do not give much aid to their children, then Comrade Kutuzov is a thousand times correct." (217)

No doubt many remarks by the oppositionists were left out of the record, but those that were included indicate the language used and the ideas expressed. Lenin's Central Committee was charged with dishonesty, burocratism, with concealing the rottenness of the Bolshevik Party. Milonov branded Lenin as the biggest of all burocrats, which drew a protest from Yaroslavsky: "Comrade Milonov gave us a good sample of these methods when he called Comrade Lenin the biggest of all 'chinovniks.'" (57). Kollontai listed a number of acts of the Central Committee showing that the Lenin leadership was the source of corruption and burocratic action against critical opponents. "Why is it that the decision of the September Conference to put a stop to the practice of exiling to distant places comrades who hold a different viewpoint from the viewpoint of the Central Committee, why has this decision not been carried out in actuality? We know

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that behind the stage there goes on a definite evaluation and reevaluation of comrades, what comrades should be retained and which removed as far as possible from the masses who are influenced by them." (54)

Trotsky's aide, Krestinsky, came to the defense of the Central Committee. He pretended that Lenin's system of appointments simply did not exist. And as to repressions, it was all a fantasy to Krestinsky: repressions "almost" never took place: "I find it my duty to state that there exists no system of appointments no repressions. I maintain that in the past practice of the Central Committee also there were almost no repressions, and the assertions of Kollontai that there have been repressions are unfounded." (59)

The representatives of the Workers Opposition as well as of the Democratic Centralists were not diverted from facts by Krestinsky's lying. Ignatov demanded a revolution in the methods of administering the Party and the State: "It is absolutely necessary that the system of appointing people in Party posts be unconditionally abolished. This institution of authorized agents and appointees must be done away with!" (130)

Insofar as Krestinsky was concerned, he was "rewarded" immediately after the Congress in a typically burocratic fashion. For having sided with Trotsky against Lenin in the Trade Union Discussion, Krestinsky was eliminated by Lenin from the Central Committee and from the Secretariat. Soon after the Congress Krestinsky was given a "vacation" in Berlin. But though he had an objective lesson that treachery and political lying do not always pay off, Krestinsky concealed the truth when he, a human wreck, was "confessing" in March 1938 at the monstrous Moscow Trials.

Kollontai advanced the following slogan at the Tenth Congress: "We must have a system of a widely unfolding democracy, confidence in the masses and a guarantee of freedom of opinion for comrades not merely on paper but in fact." (165). These remarks grated on Trotsky's ears. Accordingly, he assailed Kollontai's slogan which constituted a danger to the top burocrats: "The Workers Opposition has advanced dangerous slogans, fetishizing the principles of democracy." (192). In return, Shliapnikov branded Trotsky as a worshipper of the burocratic idol: "Comrade Trotsky accused us of making a fetish of workers democracy. This is a falsehood. You, however, make a fetish of the burocratic monster, but we don't. When we see that this or that organ is harmful we are proposing to you to destroy it. We propose to the Congress to destroy the burocratic method of directing the national economy."

Trotsky categorically rejected the proletarian principle of management through election from below. "Such a method of directing the most important factories will make for incompetence." (192). Shliapnikov's reply to this was: "Comrades say: how can we permit the introduction of the elective principle in the factories? Comrade

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Trotsky, this principle exists here in Moscow. A few days ago the workers of the power station demanded: 'Get this superintendent out of here.' So he was removed and replaced by the one whom the workers wanted. It is the worst form of election but we were compelled to carry this out. We propose organized elections." (199-200)

Shliapnikov brought into focus the fact that in Lenin's Russia workers' democracy was factually *illegal* because it conflicted, sometimes violently, with Lenin's system of appointments. Lenin could not, however, reinforce the appointive system with wholesale arrest and execution of the anti-burocratic workers. This measure was carried out later by Stalin.

6. *The Political Nature of the Workers Opposition*

Were the leading cadres of the Workers Opposition sincere? An investigator must possess positive evidence before marking one with the stigma of dishonesty. That they themselves were burocrats, though in disfavor and hounded, but burocrats nevertheless, is definite. But if a member of the bourgeoisie can break with his class, so can a burocrat break with the burocracy. However, a true revolutionary break can be effected only on the basis of scientific study. The available evidence puts the Workers Opposition into the category of superficial critics of the Party leadership. Undoubtedly, not even remotely approximating the self-abasement of the future Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Opposition Bloc, the Workers Opposition, nevertheless, in its political function was essentially a *loyal* opposition. It was the Left wing of the Bolshevik Party, supporting the basic policy of the Central Committee (Shliapnikov, *St. Rep.* 39)

But how is the political nature of the Workers Opposition painted by the chroniclers of the Stalin, Trotsky and the Liberal camps? Stalin's historians give the following portrayal of the Workers Opposition: "The 'Workers' Opposition' contended that the interests of the trade unions were opposed to those of the Soviet state and the Communist Party. They held that the trade unions, and not the Party, were the highest form of working-class organization. The 'Workers' Opposition' was essentially an anarcho-syndicalist anti-Party group." *(Hist. C. P. S. U.* 253)

There is not a single statement made by the Workers Opposition, either in theses, speeches or in Kollontai's pamphlet to warrant such an interpretation. Quite the opposite was presented by Shliapnikov in the "Statement of the Workers Opposition" to the Tenth Congress of the R. C. P.: "The viewpoint of the Workers Opposition on the Trade Unions and the organization of national economy is diametrically opposed to Anarchism and syndicalism, since the Workers Opposition does not counterpose economics to politics and does not deny the position of the dictatorship of the proletariat or the leading role of the Party or the significance of Soviets as an organ of power." *(Sten.*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Rep. 288). The Workers Opposition proposed to shift the management of industry from the Supreme Council of National Economy, which was appointed from above and was detached from the workers, to a body elected from below in the trade unions. "When we speak of a congress of producers we mean the All-Russian Congress of Trade Unions." (Shliapnikov, 198). In an article "It is Time to Analyze," Kollontai stated very emphatically: "Nowhere and at no time did the Workers Opposition express itself in favor of weakening the influence of the Party in the trade unions." *(Pravda,* Jan. 28, 1921). Ignatov announced his position on what instrument should guide the work of the State: "It is necessary that the Party guide the entire work of our State apparatus." *(Sten. Rep. Tenth Congress,* 131)

It is appropriate to point out, however, that some Bolshevik statements in favor of elevating the trade unions to equal importance with the Party were actually made, but these statements are not traceable to the Workers Opposition. One declaration, for instance, was made to the effect that the trade unions had to become in a measure the *chief* political instruments: "The trade unions, as the most numerous organizations of the proletariat, precisely now, after the political overturn which transferred the power to them, have to play a particularly big role and become to a certain degree the main political organs because all the old conceptions of politics have been overthrown and upset by the political overturn."

To say that the power was transferred to the trade unions was not in conformity either with the pre-October propaganda or with the post-October actuality. The Bolshevik propaganda before October was All Power to the Soviets; the Bolshevik *reality* in October 1917 became *all power to the foremost leaders of the Party.* No less false was the assertion that the trade unions could, to a degree, play the *main* political role. If that were correct historically than the proletariat would require no Party to guide it politically. The trade unions can under no circumstances be a substitute for the Party. The passage cited above could indeed be classified as a deviation in the direction of anarcho-syndicalism. But who was the author of that passage? Was it Shliapnikov or Kollontai? No. The author of the statement was *Lenin!* It is taken from his speech at the Second All-Russian Congress of the Trade Unions.

7. *The Frame-up of the Workers Opposition and of the Democratic Centralists*

An unhealthy regime can live only on lies and safeguard itself primarily through forcible suppression of criticism. Deeply perturbed by the "dangerous slogans" and vociferous criticism and discerning within the opposition movement a potential threat, Lenin and the rest of the ruling burocrats resolved to clamp a lid on the Workers Opposition as well as on all the other fault-finders in the Party.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

It was impossible to outlaw the Workers Opposition and the less aggressive Democratic Centralists on the basis of their anti-burocratic criticism. The high ranking burocrats had to cook up an accusation of a "theoretical" nature, and it had to be something in the realm of "trade unionism." It was not long before the charge was formulated: "syndicalist deviation." On January 25, 1921 Lenin, without even a pretense of an attempt at scientific analysis, made this bare charge: "The syndicalist deviation was revealed during the discussion particularly by Comrade Shlyapnikov and his group, the so-called Workers Opposition." *(S. W.* IX, 79). Later the label included the accusation of Anarchism. Although on Lenin's initiative the charge of "anarcho-syndicalism" became the leit-motif of the indictment against the Workers Opposition, other fictitious labels were pasted on this group, and also on the group of Democratic Centralism. The Workers Opposition was denounced as Makhaevists, after one, Makhaev, who in the early days of the Russian labor movement advocated the expulsion of intellectuals from the political proletarian organizations. Shaliapnikov's reply to this unfounded accusation was: "To this I must say that were we 'Makhaevists' we would speak only about workers. The meaning 'producer' is broader, and by narrowing it down you are pushing us toward 'Makhaevism.' With this word we are embracing all the people occupied in production." *(S. R. Tenth Congress,* 196)

One factional distortion and fabrication followed upon another. Yaroslavsky "discovered" that the Workers Opposition was of the same reactionary hue as the Right Independent Socialists of Germany: "The Workers Opposition fully identifies itself with the attacks conducted against us by the Right Independents." (144)

The Independents represented the organized labor aristocracy of Germany and were in no way connected with the peasantry. Bukharin levelled an opposite accusation: "I advance the proposition that the group which calls itself 'Workers Opposition' is really not a workers opposition but first and foremost a peasant opposition, strange as it may sound, and no matter how much the comrade-metal-workers like Shliapnikov will attempt to deny it." (120)

Bukharin was well-versed in the Lenin school of frame-ups for he himself had been framed-up by Lenin only two months before the Tenth Congress: "Comrade Lenin found it necessary to accuse me publicly of two mortal sins: first, of demagogy and vote-catching, next of syndicalism." *(Pravda,* Jan. 25, 1921)

In describing Bukharin as a demagogue, Lenin gave a fairly accurate definition of the morals of that Bolshevik scholar. But Bukharin was no more a *syndicalist* than Lenin himself. Another example of the indiscriminate way in which the Lenin circle employed frame-up labels was the case of Trotsky's proposal to introduce the NEP a year before the Tenth Congress: "At the beginning of 1920, basing myself on an analysis of the condition of peasant economy, I intro-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

duced in the Political Buro the proposal of a series of measures similar to the N.E.P." *(Stalin School,* 38). Trotsky was at once labelled as a "free trader." He related this at the Tenth Congress; "I do not know what was the position of Comrade Zinoviev on that question, but the rest of the members of the Central Committee with Lenin at the head accussed me of free-tradism." *(Sten. Rep.,* 191)

While classifying the Workers Opposition as representing an "Anarcho-Syndicalist deviation" Lenin in January 1921 had accused the Democratic Centralists as "the worst sort of Menshevism and Socialist-Revolutionism." *(Sel. Wks.,* IX, 37). At the Tenth Congress the leaders of the Democratic Centralists struck back. Rafael, recalling Zinoviev's recent demagogic talks about workers democracy, freedom of criticism and "attacks" on burocratism, said: "Comrade Yaroslavsky figures that the best argument to defend his position is to call us the worst names and paste upon us the label of Menshevism. He produced from somewhere Menshevik leaflets and reading them declared that the group of Democratic Centralism says the same thing. Comrade Yaroslavsky, read what Zinoviev said at the pre-election meeting! That was much stronger than what is contained in that Menshevik leaflet, yet you made no mention of that." *(S. R.,* 151). Indeed Zinoviev had employed strong language in describing Bolshevik burocratism: "Our burocratism is worse than the bubonic plague, worse than cholera, worse than the Right SR's." (Cited by Martinov, *Krasnaya Nov,* Jan.-Feb., 1923, 163)

Maximovsky declared that the "analysis" of the political nature of the oppositionists advanced by Yaroslavsky and by the "true proletarian" Smilga was a *police analysis:* "Comrade Yaroslavsky employs the same methods over and over again in fighting every opposition: These people are Mensheviks, Menshevik leaflets, SRs, petty-bourgeois elements. The true proletarian Comrade Smilga pushes such a line to the fore. If this is an analysis than allow me to say frankly that it is a police analysis. This is the only way to characterize such an analysis." *(St. Rep.* 171)

The central targets of the Leninist frame-up, however, were not the Democratic Centralists but the spokesman of the Workers Opposition, particularly Shliapnikov and Kollontai. They made an attempt to ward off the hailstorm of falsifications and dishonest accusations but their efforts were futile. At least they had the satisfaction of giving Lenin and his supporters to understand that the adherents of the Workers Opposition were quite aware of the fact that they were dealing with crooks: "During the pre-Congress Party discussion we have heard everything. And those labels, equivocations and insinuations which are here directed against us do not disturb us. We know who we are and we know very well with whom we are dealing." (Shliapnikov, 40)

In reply to Smilga, who proposed to expell the oppositionists, Ignatov made a veiled suggestion to expell Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Kamenev and the rest of the circle of the ruling burocrats for not carrying out the Zinovievite proletarian-democratic "decisions" of the September Conference: "And when Smilga says it is necessary to expell from the Party all those who form fractions, then I say that it is necessary to expell, before everybody else, those people who consciously avoid carrying out the decisions of the Party Conference." (175)

8. *Lenin Outlaws the Opposition*

Lenin's keynote at the Congress was: "impermissibility of opposition in the Party—this is the political conclusion of the present moment." (61). With his pet burocrat, Stalin, at the lever of the apparatus, Lenin laid down the crush-the-opposition program before his organized majority: "We are not going to be deceived by words. When they said that within the Party there are symptoms of a disease, we replied that this point deserves triple attention. Without any doubt this disease exists. Let's help to cure this disease. Tell us how you can cure it. We have spent too much time in discussion. We need now no opposition, Comrades! And I think that the Party Congress will have to draw the conclusion that for the opposition this must be the end. A lid must be clamped down on the opposition. We have had enough of oppositions! (Applause.)" (63). And Lenin made it clear that the Workers Opposition would not be permitted henceforth to present its views to the Party membership. He read from Kollontai's pamphlet the passage in which she said that the Workers Opposition would continue its struggle: " 'Even in the event of defeat at the Congress—to remain inside the Party and step by step, firmly defending our point of view, to rescue the Party and straighten out its line.' 'Even in the event of defeat at the Congress'—indeed how much forethought! (Laughter). Excuse me, but for myself I can definitely state that this the Party Congress will not permit! (Applause.)" (64)

To give the Workers Opposition and the Democratic Centralists the status of enemies of the Bolshevik Party and the State, Lenin required a cloak of legality, an official proscription of these groups. He came to the Tenth Congress armed with a decree in the form of a resolution "On Unity." When passed by the Congress the resolution would become a legitimate weapon of repression in the hands of Stalin's Orgburo and the Secretariat. Listing a number of reasons why the existence of groupings in the Party could no longer be tolerated, Lenin's resolution stated: "The congress therefore declares dissolved and orders the immediate dissolution of all groups without exception that have been formed on the basis of various platforms (such as the 'Workers Opposition' group, the 'Democratic Centralism' group, etc.) Non-compliance with this order of the congress must involve unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party." (*S. W.* IX, 134)

Matters reached the climax when Lenin introduced this resolu-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tion with some additional remarks on "anarcho-syndicalism" and a warning that "the congress regards the propaganda of these ideas as being incompatible with membership of the R.C.P." *(Ib.* 129). The Congress was tense. Lenin was about to deliver a staggering blow to the organized critics of his appointive regime. But the oppositionists did not drop to their knees. They greeted Lenin's burocratic resolution with scorn and disgust. Shliapnikov, who had witnessed much factional dishonesty in his time, declared that he had never seen anything more demagogic: "Vladimir Ilyich has given you a lecture on how to achieve unity. In all my life, in the twenty years of my being in the Party, I haven't seen and haven't heard anything more demagogic, anything which more perverted the facts than this resolution." *(Sten. Rep.* 287)

In Ignatov's opinion, demagogy in the Party achieved an all-time record in Lenin's resolution: "Upon a close examination of this resolution, it becomes plain that it furnishes a new slogan, as it were, a new manifestation of the fact that the demagogy which has been prevalent in our Party is assuming monstrous proportions." (289). Ignatov realized that Lenin's resolution was aimed at wiping out even the limited, semi-legal "freedom" of criticism which still existed: "With the introduction of this resolution you are now eliminating the possibility of discussing any questions within the Party." (290). This was precisely Lenin's goal. His machine was working smoothly, and with the aid of Trotsky, Bukharin and many other former and recent oppositionists, he had the resolution adopted. Burocratic centralization advanced a gigantic step. And as with all his other anti-working class acts, Lenin covered up the prohibition of factions with a honeyed resolution on workers democracy. Over two years later, in the Autumn of 1923, when Zinoviev, as in the September 1920, "cure the Party" Conference, led a discussion on workers democracy as a prelude to an attack on "Trotskyism," Sapronov wrote: "But it is difficult to forget that the decisions of the Tenth Congress regarding the prohibition of factions within the Party were utilized to the fullest extent to wipe out the decisions of that very Congress concerning Party democracy." *(Discussiony Sbornik,* 1923, 62)

Just as Lenin bribed specialists in the economic and military field so he did in the political field. By the tactic of bribing the leaders of the oppositions he aimed to behead the resistance movements within the Party. He had scored success with the Left Communists by bribing Bukharin with the post in the Politburo. Now he attempted the tactic with the leaders of the Workers Opposition. In his speech "Party Unity and the Anarcho-Syndicalist Deviation" addressed to the Tenth Congress, Lenin broke very interesting news. While castigating and suppressing the Workers Opposition, Lenin was including its representatives into the Central Committee of the Party: "And we hope that on the Central Committee—into which we are taking representatives of this deviation—these representatives will

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

treat the decisions of the Party Congress as all class conscious disciplined members should do." (IX, 129)

The leaders of the Workers Opposition understood the maneuver. They would be used as window-dressing to lend the Central Committee an outward semblance of democracy but in reality would be objectively covering up the oligarchs whose goal was to deprive the Party rank-and-file and lesser functionaries of the defense of their legitimate, now rather on paper, membership rights. By the Bolshevik rules no member of the Central Committee was permitted to air his own views before the membership. He could only present the official position of the Central Committee. The Workers Opposition derisively rejected the "honor," and pointed out the glaring contradictions in which the Lenin leadership had become enmeshed in its attempts to stifle the oppositionists. On the one hand they were stigmatized as anarcho-syndicalist deviators, as supporters of Menshevism, as co-thinkers of the Right Independents, as a new edition of Makhaevism, as a petty-bourgeois peasant group. On the other hand their representatives were "elected" by Lenin as bona fide Bolsheviks to the Central Committee, the guiding body of the Party. Shliapnikov immediately declined: "It is self-understood, Comrades, that since you are labelling me 'Anarchist-syndicalist,' even though with a very big reservation about 'deviation,' I cannot be an authoritative member of the Central Committee, so I inform you of my resignation." *(Sten. Rep.* 288)

However, the leaders of the Workers Opposition failed to grasp the distance between the 1917-1918 stage of burocratic centralism in the Bolshevik State when Party functionaries could still resign at will and the advanced stage when one could "resign" only with the permission of the Party dictators. Lenin at once introduced a new resolution in which the threat of disciplinary enforcement of his burocratic will was fairly obvious: "Concerning the announced resignation I propose the following resolution: 'The Congress calls upon all the members of the dissolved group of the Workers Opposition to submit to Party discipline, to obligate themselves to remain in the posts entrusted to them and rejects the resignation of Comrade Shliapnikov or any other resignations.' " (291). At the same time that Lenin was bludgeoning Shaliapnikov, he presented the coersion as a manifestation of warm comradely feelings: "When a Comrade of the 'Workers Opposition' is included in the Central Committee, this is an expression of comradely confidence." *(Ib.)*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XIX.

THE KRONSTADT REBELLION

1. *Who were the Kronstadt Mutineers*

"THE SUPPRESSION of the Kronstadt rising was one of the saddest necessities of the Russian Revolution." *(Stalin School,* "Exp. Notes," 313)

Few events have created more confusion, misinterpretation and passion among various political currents than the Kronstadt insurrection in March 1921, a week before the opening of the Tenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party. What was the political essence of the Kronstadt uprising and who were the prime movers and participants in that extraordinary historical event?

In 1921 the population of Kronstadt was about 25,000. The insurgents numbered approximately 18,000. Of these over half consisted of the crews of the Baltic Fleet which was then stationed at Kronstadt, the rest were Red Army soldiers garrisoning the forts and local workers. The sailors, composing the bulk of the insurgent forces, were not the men who had acted as the revolutionary battering ram on the night of the October overthrow. Those men had been dispatched to various fronts and most of them had perished. Intuitively, or more likely, consciously, the Bolshevik burocrats replaced the old sailors with less advanced elements drawn from areas far away from Petrograd. Before going into an analysis of the Kronstadt events, we shall first examine the political composition of the Kronstadt insurgents. Utterly untutored in the science of proletarian class struggle and therefore lacking the elementary ideological equipment to meet the dynamic problems faced by the world proletariat, this mass of sailors, soldiers and workers had no leaders of renown. Their guiding staff was a spontaneous grouping of inconspicuous men. The largest political component which was more or less homogeneous in character was the Baltic Fleet section of the Bolshevik Party. This fact is easily verifiable. Only a few weeks before the uprising the Bolshevik seamen had assembled in a Party meeting in Petrograd to cast their vote in the trade union discussion. Their number was one third of the entire personnel of the Baltic Fleet: "The meeting of the seamen-communists of the Baltic fleet, numbering 3,500 people, after the report of G. E. Zinoviev and co-report of L. D. Trotsky, sided with the 'Platform of the Ten' " (Lenin, XXVI, R. "Notes," 627)

Trotsky testifies that Zinoviev captured 90% of these votes for the Lenin Ten and that "The overwhelming majority of the sailor 'Communists' who supported Zinoviev's resolution took part in the rebellion." *(New Int.,* Aug. 1938, 249). How great was the proportion of Bolshevik Party members in the garrison and among the Kronstadt workers is not clear. While, as Trotsky records, 90% of the seamen-Communists participated in the uprising, the Kronstadt membership of the Party, also according to Trotsky, was divided, as mentioned

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by Smilga: "Of our Kronstadt comrades-Communists, according to Comrade Trotsky, about 30% are taking an active part against us, about 40% are neutral and only the rest are fighting the Kronstadt mutineers." *(Sten. Rep. Tenth Cong.* 137)

In 1937 Trotsky spoke of ". . . the Kronstadt revolt, which attracted into its ranks no small number of Bolsheviks . . ." *(Rev. Bet.* 96). It is safe to conclude that of the 18,000 Kronstadt rebels, approximately one fourth were Bolshevik Party members, recent supporters of Lenin. The others were a conglomoration of indefinite elements.

2. *The Political Immaturity of the Kronstadt Rebels*

Why did the Baltic sailors, who only yesterday had cast their votes for the Lenin leadership, suddenly rise in rebellion? Did they become aware of the fact that they had been duped by Zinoviev? Trotsky says that Zinoviev won the support of the Communist sailors by means of demagogy, at the same time terrorizing and isolating Trotsky's adherents. Circumspectly omitting the name of the man behind Zinoviev, Trotsky writes: "On the part of the Petrograd committee the campaign was carried on in an extremely demagogic manner. The commanding personnel of the fleet was isolated and terrified. Zinoviev's resolution received, probably, 90% of the votes." *(New Int.,* Aug. 1938, 249). Evidently, the sailors were not duped very long by Zinoviev's demagogic promises. On their return to Kronstadt they began to realize that they have been cheated by Zinoviev and induced to support dishonest maneuvers of a dishonest leadership. On February 28, 1921 the crew of the battleship *Petropavlovsk,* renamed *The Marat,* adopted a resolution which in effect renounced the burocratic policies of the Lenin regime. By coincidence, on that very day Lenin penned the following admission: "Of course, within our apparatus there is much imperfection, vileness, because much burocratism has penetrated into it, much too much." *(C. W.* XXVI, R. 183)

In opposition to this vile burocratic apparatus headed by Lenin, the bitter but politically blind sailors made another bold move. On March 1, 1921 a mass meeting was held in Yakorny Square, Kronstadt, attended by 15,000 people, mainly sailors. The meeting was presided over by Bolshevik Lenin supporter burocrat Vasiliev, chairman of the Kronstadt Ispolcom (Executive Committee of the Soviet) and addressed by Kalinin, representative of the Sovnarkom. Over the objection of Vasiliev and Kalinin, the meeting adopted the *Petropavlovsk* resolution demanding "Freely elected Soviets," "Freedom of speech and press for Anarchists and left Socialist Parties," and the release of all arrested SRs, Mensheviks and Anarchists. Kalinin immediately departed to report to Lenin.

On the 2 of March a conference of these disaffected elements was held at the Kronstadt House of Education with delegates from the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

crews of the Fleet, from Red Army units, with many factory workers present. The first two speakers were Bolshevik Commissars Vasiliev and Kuzmin. Following the spread of a rumor that the Sovnarkom's troops were about to attack the meeting, a "Provisional Revolutionary Committe" was elected to direct the defense. Kuzmin and Vasiliev were placed under arrest.

In their propaganda the Kronstadters said of the 1917 events: "The toilers of Russia finally realized that they would not escape the thraldom under the landlord and the capitalist, that a new slavery was being prepared for them—the power of the bourgeoisie. Their patience reached the limit and through the united effort of sailors, the Army, workers and peasants in October 1917 the bourgeoisie was cast aside. It seemed as if the toiling people had come into their own. But the Party of the Communists, filled with self-seeking people, seized power in its own hands and pushed aside the peasants and workers in whose name it was acting. It resolved, after the pattern of landlord Russia, to rule the country through the agency of its commissars." *(Kronstadt Izvestia,* March 12, 1921)

This was as close as the Kronstadters ever got to a semblance of a political analysis.

3. *The International Imperialists and the Kronstadters*

The American imperialists were favorably inclined toward Kronstadt; it was reported that the Red Cross was considering sending food and medical supplies. The farsighted British imperialists, however, sided with Lenin and Trotsky against Kronstadt. Lloyd George evidently had no doubts of the impending catastrophic wind-up of the Kronstadt affair. For the moment it was adequate for him to secure a guarantee from the Lenin regime that it would not stir up trouble within the British Empire. Having secured that pledge Lloyd George concluded a treaty with the Sovnarkom representatives during the Kronstadt situation. As reported both in the capitalist and the Bolshevik press—"The Soviet Government particularly agrees to refrain from any encouragement of Asiatic peoples to action against British interests, especially in Asia Minor, Persia, Afganistan and India." (Dispatch from London, *N. Y. T.,* March 17, 1921; *Izvestia,* March 22, 1921)

Lloyd George, naturally, appreciated the fact that the conclusion of the treaty was a conspicuous expression of recognition of the stability of the Lenin regime and would be far-reaching in its consequences. That the British imperialist policy was a shattering blow to the hope and morale of the Russian bourgeoisie is obvious. The American imperialists, who doggedly refused to deal with the Lenin Government, manifested displeasure. In an editorial entitled "Lenin's Lucky Week," *The New York Times* reflected sourly: "Mr. Lloyd George selects this moment for an act which powerfully reinforces Bolshevist prestige in Russia, which is as important a Communist

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

victory in the Russian domestic struggle as the recapture of Kronstadt." (March 19, 1921)

Thus, on the issue whom to support, the Kremlin or Kronstadt, the international bourgeoisie did not act in unison.

4. *The Mensheviks, SRs, Anarchists and Kronstadt*

In the literature of the Mensheviks, SRs and Anarchists Kronstadt is likened to the Paris Commune. This grotesque distortion is a result either of wishful thinking or of crass ignorance or, more likely, of conscious misrepresentations. The French bourgeoisie battled the Commune. The Russian bourgeoisie backed Kronstadt. This alone would have sufficed for any thinking person to recognize the dissimilarity of the two movements.

At the first report of events in Kronstadt the non-Bolshevik tendencies within the masses concentrated their hopeful gaze on that focal point. The White Guard government of Esthonia accommodated the SR leader Chernov with the use of the Revel radio to send a message to Kronstadt: "The Chairman of the Constituent Assembly, Victor Chernov, sends his fraternal greetings to the heroic comrade-sailors, the Red Army men and workers, who for the third time since 1905 are throwing off the yoke of tyranny. He offers to assist with men and to provision Kronstadt through the Russian cooperatives abroad." (Quoted in *Izvestia,* July 13, 1922, and in the SR *Revolutsionnayá Rossiya,* May 1921)

Petrichenko, the Chairman of the Kronstadt Revolutionary Committee, in his reply to Chernov hinted at eventual collaboration with the SRs: "The Provisional Revolutionary Committee is thankfull for the offer of Comrade Chernov, but it refrains for the present, that is, till further developments become clarified. Meantime everything will be taken into consideration." (Quoted by Alexander Berkman in the *Kronstadt Rebellion,* 16). For the moment Petrichenko declined Chernov's offer in order not to place a strong ideological weapon in Lenin's hands. At the same time he expressed no political opposition to Chernov, and rather indicated that he would work with the SRs if the Kronstadt rebellion took firm root.

The pattern of the events to come in the event of Kronstadt's success could have been read in history. In June 1918, after the seizure of Samara by the Czechoslovaks, the SRs and Mensheviks established a government composed of members of the Constituent Assembly elected from Samara province. At first this government was actively and warmly supported by the same Chernov but it soon gave way to the openly bourgeois Ufa Directorate in the face of Chernov's impotent whimpering in a so-called "Chernov Manifesto" *(Sovremennia Zapiski,* XLV (1931), 348). And on November 18, 1918 the Directorate was removed by the White Guard dictator, Admiral Kolchak. This

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was a preview of the future of the Kronstadt movement if "further developments become clarified."

The height of muddle-headedness was reached by the Anarchists. Everybody knew that the Bolshevik leaders would never relinquish power voluntarily, and it was no secret that the aim of Kronstadt was the overthrow of the Bolshevik regime. Having been subjected to a long process of idealist miseducation, the Anarchists imagined they could persuade the Bolshevik burocratic usurpers to get together with the Kronstadters in a comradely conference. In an appeal to the Bolshevik leaders several Anarchists, including Alexander Berkman and Emma Goldman, then in Russia, declared: "Concerning the conflict between the Soviet Government and the workers and sailors, we hold that it must be settled not by force of arms but by means of comradely, fraternal revolutionary agreement." (Berkman, 33)

Emotionally and ideologically the Anarchists leaned toward politically chaotic, seemingly proletarian revolutionary Kronstadt. Frustrated in their attempt to bring about negotiations for peace, profoundly shocked at the severity of the quelling of the mutiny and at the repressions that followed, Berkman and Goldman left Russia in a rage. But they never understood the political nature of the Lenin-Trotsky regime.

5. *The Bolshevik Burocrats and Kronstadt*

Quick to grasp the political line of Kronstadt, Lenin in his report to the Tenth Congress correctly assessed the potential magnitude of the danger of the rebellion: "This petty-bourgeois counter-revolution is undoubtedly more dangerous than Denikin, Yudenich and Kolchak put together." Skilled in suppressing the truth the Bolshevik burocrats branded Kronstadt a *White Guard* affair. "A New White Guard Conspiracy" declared an official announcement in *Izvestia* on March 3, 1921. "The White Guards have appointed Zemsky as commandant of Kronstadt" shouted *Izvestia* on March 12, 1921. The uprising of the crews of the entire Baltic Fleet and of Red Army soldiers and Bolshevik workers of Kronstadt was dishonestly likened to the Yaroslavl uprising of the Tsarist officers who on the day they seized control openly declared allegiance to the White Guard general Alexeev. "Kronstadt is a miserable replica of Yaroslavl" lied *Izvestia.* Trotsky in his radio ultimatum to the Kronstadters on March 5 slandered them as "White Guard mutineers." *(Izvestia,* March 8, 1921)

The labelling of the Kronstadters as "White Guards" was as devoid of scientific accuracy as the labelling of Schliapnikov and Kollontai as "anarcho-syndicalists," "near-Social-Democrats" and "Peasant Opposition," or of Bukharin as a "syndicalist" or of Trotsky as a "free-trader." Only yesterday, so to speak, Lenin, Zinoviev, Stalin and other leaders of the Ten had been proud of these "White Guards." Years later Trotsky, in trying to create the impression that he had held aloof

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

from the suppression of Kronstadt, inadvertently indicated that a good number of these "White Guard mutineers" were really erstwhile supporters of Lenin: "I considered, and the Political Buro made no objections, that negotiations with the sailors, and in case of necessity, their pacification, should be placed with those leaders who only yesterday enjoyed the political confidence of these sailors. Otherwise the Kronstadters would consider the matter as though I had come to take 'revenge' upon them for their voting against me during the party discussion." *(New Int.*, Aug. 1938, 249-250)

Except for Kalinin's speech in Yakorny Square, the Bolshevik leaders never negotiated with Kronstadt. Two days following Trotsky's rigid radio ultimatum, a bombardment of the forts began. On March 17-18, 1921 the Sovnarkom forces, composed almost exclusively of *kursanti*—cadets of military schools—aided by 300 delegates of the Tenth Congress, took Kronstadt by storm.

That Trotsky personally directed the operations against the sailors is a fact, notwithstanding all his denials. But that the work of rounding up and inflicting an exceptionally harsh and bloody punishment on these luckless, ignorant sailors was not his is probably true. That task was supervised by the head of the Cheka, whom Trotsky later eulogized as a 'fortune for the workers.' In 1938 Trotsky stated: "Concerning the repression, so far as I remember, Dzerzhinsky had personal charge of them and Dzerzhinsky could not tolerate anyone's interference with his functions (and properly so). Whether there were any needless victims I do not know. On this score I trust Dzerzhinsky more than his belated critics." (250)

6. *Whose Victory Was It?*

Of course, the *kursanti* sincerely believed they fought in the interests of the people, in the cause of the world revolution. Lenin and Trotsky knew better. But Lenin and Trotsky were not aware of the fact that the man who more thany anyone else benefited by the victory over Kronstadt was Stalin. By March 1921 he had become the real wielder of the entire State apparatus.

Trotsky's crushing of Kronstadt was no less vital to Stalin's future absolute personal dictatorship than Lenin's crushing of the Workers Opposition and the prohibition of factions in the Bolshevik Party. All these events, including the nomination of Stalin for the post of General Secretary, occurred within the compass of just a few days, in the middle of March 1921. That crucial moment of history was described by the editors of *The New York Times* as "Lenin's Lucky Week." Careful analysis shows them to have been wrong. It was a lucky week for Stalin.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XX.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WORKERS OPPOSITION

1. *A Sordid Deed*

IN JANUARY 1924, during the discussion of "Trotskyism" when the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev clique, for demagogic reasons, allowed a brief interlude of limited freedom of expression, Shliapnikov told of the campaign of persecution that had been carried out against the leading elements of the Workers Opposition: "After the Tenth Congress the fight was conducted against the 'deviation', i.e. against all those who had voted at the conference of the 'Workers Opposition' as well as the delegates of that tendency at the Congress. The fight was carried on not on ideological grounds but by way of withholding means of earning a livelihood, removal from jobs, systematic transfers and even expulsion from the Party. Every member who came forward in defense of the Tenth Congress resolution on workers democracy was accused of being a partisan of the Workers Opposition and a destroyer of the Party, and was subjected to all the repressions of the regime of burocratic authority." *(Pravda,* Jan. 18, 1924. Cited by Zorky in *Workers Opposition,* R. 154, and by E. Yaroslavsky in *Against Opposition,* R. 154)

Trotsky and the other leaders who in 1923 were suddenly forced into the role of "Oppositionists" had acted hand in hand with Stalin and the bloodhound Dzerzinsky in crushing the revolutionary workers who invoked Lenin's Resolution on Workers Democracy, as testified to by Shliapnikov: "This fight continued up to the very eve of the present discussion. And it was conducted in all fury not only by the official leading circles of the Party but also by the leaders of the present Opposition, a greater part of whom were among the members of the leading Party bodies. In league with the apparatus the present leaders of the Opposition terrified Party circles with cries about the danger of the 'Workers Opposition' and unconditionally supported all the methods of inner-Party suppression of every member who made an attempt, in defending the idea of curing the Party, to lean precisely on the resolution of the Tenth Congress, which the leaders of the 'Opposition' now declare to be their 'creed.' This is the chief reason why the decisions of the Tenth Congress were not carried out." *(Pravda,* Jan. 18, 1924)

Trotsky's participation in the hounding of the Workers Opposition was an important factor in transforming the glowing resolution of the Tenth Congress on workers democracy into a dead letter. He thus insured the further rise of Stalin's power, just as his participation in the Leninist Recruiting in 1924 helped Stalin make a dead letter of the December 1923 joint resolution on Workers Democracy. In this 1923 resolution Trotsky, to "whitewash" his own support to the frame-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

up of the Workers Opposition, upheld that frame-up while already under a frame-up cloud himself. He stated: "The most lasting and from certain aspects, the most dangerous group, was that of the 'Workers Opposition." ("Burocratism and Factional Groupings," *New Course; New Int.*, Jan. 1935, 17). The Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Opposition Bloc, subsequently in Stalin's meshes, treacherously continued defaming and calumniating the Workers Opposition. In the October 16, 1926 Declaration Trotsky and his allies said: "We share fully Lenin's evaluation of the platform of the 'Workers Opposition' which was defended by Shliapnikov and Medvedev."

Barmin furnished an interesting sidelight on the inhuman punishment administered by Trotsky to the supporters of the Workers Opposition. Since at the time Barmin furnished this information he was a fugitive from Stalin's domain, in a sense feeling for others hounded by the GPU, it is reasonable to assume that his aim was merely to relate the incidents he witnessed rather than to shift the guilt from the Central Committee and its General Secretary onto Trotsky: "The Central Committee no doubt remembered the very odd way in which the pupils of the College had voted during the debate on the Trade Unions question, when the majority of us had declared for the working-class opposition, that is to say for the extreme Left of the Party, against Lenin, Trotsky, Bukharin and Tomsky. More or less well informed about the state of mind prevalent in our ranks, the Central Committee decided that the College must be subjected to a 'purge.' At this time it was under the dictatorship of a former general and a former colonel of the Imperial Army, Lebediev and Afanassiev. The purge descended on our heads like a cloudburst. It was administered relentlessly by a commission enjoying full powers and acting in secret. Among its members were Boubnov, who later became People's Commissar for education, and Skliansky, Trotsky's assistant. It sentenced men to exclusion from the Party and from the College, or both together, giving any reason that seemed good to it, or often giving none at all. In this way it threw into the street, without employment and with their reputations compromised, a number of officers who had done splendid work at the front and had just finished their military studies. Several of these wretches committed suicide." (165-6)

Barmin's reminiscences of the vicious purge of the military school tally with the statement Shliapnikov made many years before with regard to the systematic tortures suffered by the subjectively anti-burocratic opposition elements. But the 250 military students of that single institution were only a minute fraction of the great host of the nameless, unremembered revolutionary workers put to the rack by the small band of Bolshevik burocrats. Shliapnikov asserted that "Since the Tenth Congress thousands of comrades were tried and condemned for the ideas of workers democracy within the Party—" (*Pravda*, Jan. 18, 1924). Depriving the oppositionists of means of subsistence, assassinating their character, Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin drove

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

their victims, many of the best proletarians in the Bolshevik Party, to a slow, agonizing death by starvation or to a blank wall of despair and self-destruction.

2. *Lenin's Double Standard on Factionalism*

We have shown that between 1923 and 1928 Stalin's strategy in wiping out the Trotsky sector of the Party was of a two-fold nature. He systematically destroyed the nameless mass base of the Opposition, meantime transforming most of the hounded leaders into demoralized creatures who could endure less and less the pressure of burocratic centralism. The morally decrepit 1923-1928 Opposition leaders, through their futile declaration of loyalty to Stalin, proved an ideal cover for the extermination of the proletarian vanguard. But it was not Stalin who originated this shrewd two-fold method of eliminating opposition workers and breaking down their leaders. He was merely a gifted imitator of Lenin who proved very skillful in reducing the leaders of the oppositionists to miserable human wrecks. The results of this Leninist tactic were noted by Riazanov at the Eleventh Congress of the Party: "Our Central Committee is a special institution. The saying goes that the British Parliament can perform anything except transform a man into a woman. Our Central Committee is far more powerful. It has already transformed more than one very revolutionary man into a sissy and the number of such sissies is increasing incredibly." *(Sten Rep.* 69)

With the leaders of the Workers Opposition Lenin played a cat and mouse game. Kutuzov and Shliapnikov, his hostages on the Central Committee, were not at all treated in the same manner as were the privileged "Grand Duke" Stalin and other Leninist members of the Central Committee. Shliapnikov and Kutuzov always had the threat of expulsion and arrest as a consequence hanging over their heads. At a Party fraction meeting in July 1921 Shliapnikov uttered a few remarks of criticism of some aspects of Lenin's policy (M. Zorki, *Workers Opposition,* 49). Informers immediately reported to Lenin. Thereupon Lenin called the Central Committee and the Central Control Commission into session and made a motion to expell Shliapnikov: "Shliapnikov was tried, and in the Central Committee three votes were lacking to expel him from the Party." (Lenin, XXVII, R. 268). But did Lenin really intend to oust Shliapnikov from the Party? Back in 1917 when Zinoviev and Kamenev had sabotaged the Central Committee decision for the overthrow of the Kerensky government, Lenin, probably by arrangement with Trotsky, resorted to an "expulsion" pressure against Zinoviev and Kamenev—according to Trotsky's testimony: "Lenin proposed even to expel them from the Party. I opposed this proposition, and we had a great majority in the Central Committee against the expulsion. Lenin was very satisfied, because it was for him only a matter of putting pressure on them." *(The Case,* 76).

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

5.0
CCEPT-

If Lenin was able in 1918 to railroad through his Brest program and the turning over to the Kaiser of the revolutionary masses of the Baltic countries and the Ukraine against the obstinate oppositional majority in the Party and the Soviets, what difficulty could there have been in 1921, at the height of his power, in manipulating the expulsion of a leader of the outlawed Workers Opposition! It is obvious that Lenin was playing with Shliapnikov as a cat with a mouse.

After the Tenth Congress Stalin's snoopers and spies failed to uncover even a semblance of an underground Workers Opposition. However, the former members of the disbanded Workers Opposition devotedly clung to its militant memory and in that way kept alive their faith in the fight against Lenin's puppet-dictators in industry and in the Party. Lenin was determined to stamp out even this unorganized, whispering expression of anti-burocratism. He had the former oppositionists arraigned on the spurious charge of violating the Tenth Congress decision on the impermissibility of forming factional groupings. Shliapnikov in 1924 recalled those purge "trials" carried out by the burocratically-centralized apparatus directed by Stalin: "After the Tenth Congress, in spite of the fact that no one could establish the existence of any organizational fraction group of the 'Workers Opposition' inside our Party organization, its supporters were always hounded and tried precisely as organizers of groups and destroyers of Party unity." (*Pravda,* January 18, 1924; Yaroslavsky, *Against the Opposition,* 21; Zorky, *Workers Opposition,* 154)

It is virtually a truism that unscrupulous politicians and usurpers arrogate to themselves the rights which they deny to those whom they rob, oppress and denounce as offenders. Lenin's Resolution on Party Unity, passed by the Tenth Congress, expressly enjoined *all* Party members from "engaging in factionalism." Seemingly sweeping in its scope, the Resolution was not binding on the top burocrats. Apart from the secret Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev faction already operating at the time of the Tenth Congress, a secret faction was formed by Lenin and Trotsky to counteract Bukharin's attempt to launch a faction at the Third Congress of the Comintern in June-July 1921: "Although this took place after the Tenth Party Congress which prohibited factions, Lenin nevertheless assumed the initiative at that time to create the top nucleus of a new faction for the struggle against the ultra-Leftists who were strong at that time. In our intimate conferences, Lenin flatly put the question of how to carry on the subsequent struggle should the Third World Congress accept Bukharin's viewpoint. Our 'faction' of that time did not develop further only because our opponents 'folded up' considerably during the Congress." (*Third Int. After Lenin,* 89). In one place Trotsky refers to the minutes of the Politburo of March 18, 1926 (*Stalin School,* 34), which record him as stating: "Vladimir Ilyich said at that time: 'Well, we are forming a new faction.' "

Thus Lenin, when he saw fit, violated his own resolution on the

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

/5.0
ACCEPT-

prohibition of factions—the tyrannical measure with which he muzzled the adherents of the Workers Opposition, of the Democratic Centralists and the entire rank-and-file membership of the Bolshevik Party. The penalty for violation of the decision of the Tenth Congress on Party Unity by members of the Central Committee was "to reduce them to the status of candidates and, as an extreme measure, to expell them from the Party." (Lenin, *S. W.* 134). Naturally, Lenin did not apply this provision to himself.

3. *The Oppositionists at the Eleventh Congress*

The last Leninist Congress of the Bolshevik Party was held from March 27 to April 1922. The presence of a number of unwearied protestors against the plague of burocratic centralism disturbed Lenin and his coterie. Although he had little to fear, yet he probably seethed with fury as he listened to the recital of his burocratic misdeeds. Kossior indicated how the brutal Kremlin rulers had been reacting toward Party members who found enough courage to voice criticism. "When anyone had the courage and considered it necessary to come out with criticism or point out this or that shortcoming which we have in the domain of Soviet and Party building, he was immediately branded as an oppositionist and was reported to proper authorities and such a comrade was removed." *(Sten. R.* 113). Everybody present knew the fatal meaning of the word "removed." For a critic of Lenin's regime now an order for removal was virtually a death warrant. Shliapnikov asserted that Lenin and Frunze had threatened to use machine guns against the Workers Opposition: "Yesterday Vladimir Ilyitch said here that we spread panic and that with people who spread panic it is necessary to struggle with machine gun fire. This is the second time that I hear and feel machine gun fire directed against me. Already twice. At this moment the two machine-gunners are sitting side by side—here they are, these two machine-gunners. (Laughter). Back in August yet, when I was tried, and since then, when the Tenth Congress placed me as a hostage of the Workers Opposition in the Central Committee—I was tried there often—Comrade Frunze promised that he would convince me he was right by means of machine guns. Let us consider these words seriously. These machine gun pictures awaken in us certain recollections from the history of other revolutions." (91)

The former Left Communist, Stukov, a Bolshevik since 1905, tried to prove to Lenin that it was not right to persecute the members of the Party for daring to repeat what Lenin himself had said only recently: "It is necessary to grant also to other comrades the right to talk of what they see, what they observe. It is necessary to give them the possibility of speaking freely within the Party, not to threaten these people with damnation because they dare to say what Lenin said to us yesterday." (90)

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
ACCEPT-

For a period prior to the Congress many honest Communist workers ruefully surveyed the foul organization which they had once believed to be the revolutionary party of the proletariat, and quietly dropped out. Medvedev, a former leader of the Workers Opposition, made a point of it at the Congress: "The best proletarians who worked for years in the ranks of our Party, who rendered it the greatest service, who sacrificed everything for the Party, are leaving the Party." (106). Medvedev's remarks evoked a totally opposite reaction within the ruling clique from what he had expected. Lenin and his Stalin-directed repressive apparatus would not let the best revolutionary workers escape its clutches. They at once indicated that they would chain these workers to the Party by the threat of ostracism and the dread fate that was being inflicted on the known or suspected oppositionists. A burocratic whip, Manuilsky, made it too plain to be missed: "It is necessary not to create a halo about these old Party workers who turn in their membership cards. On the contrary, it is necessary to create such an atmosphere that when one turns in his Party card he should feel himself a Judas repudiating his class." (294)

Kollontai, who still retained a spark of her former fire, told the usurpers a few unpleasant things. "The working class does not feel 'at home' in our Party." (177). Already considerably bent under Lenin's hammering and persecution she merely criticized the surface features of the moral corruption of the men in power: "When the Control Commission asked me 'Do you submit to this decision?' I answered: 'Of course.'—'This means you will in no case come out and fight as before?' To this I gave a definite reply: 'I shall struggle as I struggled before. Every time I observe things which do not correspond to what the Party itself has decided, I shall turn to the proper Party channels with a protest and criticism. I shall not only do that but consider that you as a Control Commission must obligate me to do so." (178)

In her speech Kollontai dealt with the "Declaration of the Twenty-two"—an appeal presented after the Tenth Congress by twenty-two leading former members of the Workers Opposition to the Comintern Executive: "The essence of the content of the declaration states: 'the Party has broken away from the masses.' This break exists, it is here, and no one denies this fact. This is our misfortune, our affliction. When you appear in a factory in which there are 900 workers and when at the meetings the Party resolution is supported by 22 votes with 4 abstentions, while the rest simply do not vote, this points to the inertia, to the break-away, to all the dark sides of our Party life against which it is necessary to struggle." *(Ib.)*

Commenting on the legitimate act of the former leaders of the Workers Opposition of presenting their declaration to the Comintern Executive, Kollontai attempted to save her comrades who were being punished for that act: "We demanded that the Comintern call on our leading comrades to change the regime in the Party and to do what should be done and how to do it. There is no crime in that, yet the

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

/5.0
\CCEPT-

question has been posed to expel several comrades. But comrades, will that eliminate the disease which exists in the Party, the phlegmatism, reduction of activity, absence of critical thinking—which is an indispensable stimulus, because if we won't think we won't find the way out of the situation separating us from the masses. The expulsion of these comrades will not halt the disease but will drive it inward. Think, comrades, what will be the reaction in the localities. Workers should bring their initiative into construction, should participate in the creative life, but such a measure will not facilitate that. On the contrary: Will not this measure drive the disease inward, won't there be even more silence, passivity, and even greater exodus of workers from the Party and far greater lack of confidence in their own forces? Such a decision must not be carried out for the sake of lifting the faith of the working class in itself. It is necessary to transform the Party regime in such a way as to create the possibility for the workers in the Party to develop their initiative. We stand for the decision of the Tenth Congress on Workers democracy and freedom of inner-Party criticism. We want that decision to be confirmed in deed, not merely in words, not merely on paper." (179)

But Kollontai's plea fell on deaf ears. The Kremlin ruler was irreconcilably at odds with his own resolution on workers democracy, a demagogic scrap of paper which he flouted in practice and behind which he unswervingly pursued his burocratic objectives. The Tenth Congress had established a *Discussion Sheet* which was to be published regularly between Congresses. Kollontai exposed the maneuver with the "Discussion Sheet": "Our Party units, instead of actively participating in work, are occupied with studying commercial geography. Were the questions on the agenda of the Congress discussed in advance? No. The 'Discussion Sheet' came out virtually one day before the Congress. The root of the trouble lies in the regime of the Party. It must be changed in order for the workers to begin to feel 'at home' in the Party and be enabled to carry out their class, proletarian policy." (179)

The type of training the members of the Party received can be gleaned from the remarks of Solts, Stalin's lieutenant on the Presidium of the Central Control Commission. Communist workers had faced situations compelling them to resort to bribes in order to obtain food supplies. For such situations Solts issued the following Leninist guidance: "If some comrade is troubled about offering a bribe in a given case he should go to the organization and inquire how to proceed in that particular instance. But in general you should give a bribe and arrange it so that the one who received it should suffer the deserving punishment because if the grain must be procured you've got to work in such a way that you procure it. It's a question of expediency. Ethics has nothing to do with it." (184)

The Bolshevik burocrats taught the revolutionary workers the despicable tricks practiced in the bourgeois underworld!

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

After the Lenin period, as is well known in anti-Stalin circles, spying by workers on their comrades in the Party and in the factories became an unwritten law. This method of safeguarding the burocracy originated with Lenin. In August 1921 he instructed the workers to spy on their own comrades in the Party, on all those who charged that the leadership had lost faith in the working class, in short, on the supporters of Kollontai and Shliapnikov. Lenin's instruction to the workers in August 1921 was: "Every class-conscious worker must expose and expel those who shout about our 'lack of confidence in the forces of the working class.' "... *(S. W.* IX, 250). A note to volume XXVII of Lenin's *Works* (R. 497) makes it plain that he had the Workers Opposition in mind: "The slogan, 'More confidence in the forces of the working class' a demagogic attempted appeal to the less class conscious layers of the working class—was put forth by the 'Workers Opposition.' "

The centers to which all the secret denunciations flowed and from which Lenin was securing confidential information on the activities of the former Workers Opposition were Stalin's Orgburo, the Central Control Commission and the Secretariat. This was disclosed at the Eleventh Congress. When Lenin stated he knew what Medvedev had said outside the Congress, Medvedev interrupted: "Who keeps you informed?" Lenin replied: "I am being informed by the institutions established by the Congress of the R.C.P.: the Orgburo of the Central Committee, the Secretariat of the C.C. and the Central Control Commission." (XXVII, R. 270)

The revolutionary workers in the Party and in the factories knew that they were being spied on by the apparatus. They were in a state of constant alarm, not knowing whom to trust, as Kutazov reported at the Eleventh Congress: "People begin to regard one another with fear. They dread one another. They talk in whispers lest someone should overhear. That's the condition we have reached." *(St. R.* 406)

Lenin set up a commission at the Eleventh Congress to liquidate the remnants of the Workers Opposition. At the head of this police body was Stalin, now officially the General Secretary of the Central Committee. His direct assistants in the task were Zinoviev, Yaroslavsky, Kirov and Kaganovich. Stalin launched a permanent open season on the former leaders and followers of the Workers Opposition. The Central Committee ordered Kollontai to Norway on a diplomatic mission where her last spark of protest eventually became extinguished. Other leaders were intimidated not so much by means of personal maltreatment as through a wave of terror against their rank and file followers.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XXI.

LENIN'S GREAT-RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

1. *The "Buffer State" Farce*

THE BOLSHEVIK leaders engaged in a fantastic series of schemes, concoctions and wily tricks. Some of them were ingenious, others were awkward and transparently clownish. To the last category belongs the Siberian "Buffer State" affair which was part of Lenin's foreign policy maneuvers chiefly with the Japanese imperialists.

Following the destruction of Kolchak's forces Lenin introduced a unique policy in Siberia. In conflict with the deepest aspirations of the Siberian workers and poor peasants, he established a "frontier," not defined and in actuality a fiction, between Siberia and what was officially called "The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic." In Siberia itself he prevented the formation of a Soviet form of State and set up instead a bourgeois-democratic contrivance under his control. This was the "Buffer State." Lenin aimed to create a "neutral" ground for commercial relations with the bourgeoisie and a cover for the Japanese rulers who faced a severe internal crisis. Lenin's chief commissar for the "Buffer State" put it in these words: "In order to lay the basis for the necessity of establishing a buffer and especially for its acceptance by Japan, Russia put forth the formulation of aims which she pursues by giving its consent to the formation of a buffer: 'Soviet Russia seeks to create such a zone where the capitalist states would have the possibility of finding customary conditions which would facilitate the establishment of normal trade relations' " (Vilensky (Sibiriakov), *Soviet Russia on the Shores of the Pacific*, R. 20)

The Kremlin rulers christened their "buffer" *The Far Eastern Republic*. The inventor of this odd mechanism was Lenin: "On Lenin's proposal a so-called buffer state was created in the Far East—the Far Eastern Republic" (*Japanese Intervention 1918-1922 in Documents*, R. 125). Since the military forces which had defeated Kolchak were directed by Lenin as were the Communist Party in Siberia and the Far Eastern military organization called "The People's Revolutionary Army," the "buffer" was fully under his control. He appointed officials through whom he conducted its affairs: "The Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party directs the policy of the Far Eastern Republic through a Far Eastern Buro appointed from the center and directly responsible to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party." (Decision of the C.C. of R.C.P. of 13 of July, 1920. Quoted in *Gr. S. Enc.* XX, 289)

The masquerade of the "buffer state" started on April 6, 1920 and continued until November 14, 1922. As with every other act of departure from the pre-October programmatic pledges, Lenin encountered opposition: "On the question of forming a buffer state in the Far East in 1920 there arose differences in the Party organization." (287)

Avoiding setting up an administration along Soviet lines, Lenin

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

resorted to bourgeois political forms, the Zemstvos, Constituent Assembly and People's Assembly which he secretly dominated through his Far Eastern Buro: "In that manner, through the Far Eastern Buro, the Central Committee assured for itself the direction of the Constituent Assembly and later of the People's Assembly of the Far Eastern Republic." (289)

It is interesting to note that Lenin constantly railed at the Mensheviks and the SRs for their advocacy of Constituent Assembly. He declared, "The word 'Constituent' is a term of abuse among us, not only among the educated Communists, but also among the peasants. They know from practical experience that the Constituent Assembly and the White Guards are one and the same, that the latter inevitably come after the former." (Report at the Third Congress of the C.I. July 5, 1921, *S. W.* IX, 233). But behind the scenes Lenin was quietly operating a "Constituent Assembly" of his own. Lenin's "Constituent Assembly" was really a screen for the Sovnarkom maneuvers, to be removed at an appropriate moment.

While offering the Japanese military rulers a device whereby they could save face, Lenin was actually concerned with his own burocratic interests. The fear of world proletarian-democratic revolution being uppermost in his mind, he realized that a humiliating defeat for the Japanese militarists in Siberia would have undoubtedly rendered matters in Japan beyond their control. A mass uprising in Japan would have set Asia on fire, and would have touched off a mighty proletarian explosion in Europe. On November 27, 1920, Lenin observed that "All Asia is in ferment."

That Japan was in the throes of profound industrial and social crises, the worst in the country's history, was obvious. Isolated from the Western world, particularly due to strained relation with the United States, the country was seething with discontent. This was clear to the Kremlin oligarch who knew, therefore, that the Japanese military rulers had no choice but to accept his proposal. "Thus Japan was isolated. Moreover, under the influence of the world economic crisis of 1920-21 which crashed also upon Japanese industry, within the bourgeoisie of Japan itself a movement developed demanding the termination of the intervention which involved monstrous expenditures. If to all this is added the rise of the proletarian movement inside the country and the partial decomposition of the armies of intervention under the influence of the Russian revolution and the partisan movement, it becomes obvious why the Japanese Government was finally forced to adopt a peaceful method of realizing its imperialist aims, namely, the method of creating between Japan and Soviet Russia a buffer state, built on the principles of the bourgeois system." (*Gr. Sov. Enc.* XX, 218)

The "buffer state" masquerade involved Lenin in the pretended formality of recognizing his puppet. On May 14, 1920 Chicherin

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

addressed an official note to the Sovnarkom's own stooge regime in Siberia:

"Mr. Krasnoschekoff. Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Far Eastern Republic. On behalf of the Government of the RSFSR I have the honour to inform you that taking into consideration the declaration of the Provisional Government of the Far Eastern Republic with regard to the formation of an independent democratic Republic on the basis stated in the said declaration, the RSFSR hereby recognizes the establishment of the said democratic Republic with the Provisional Government at its head. The Soviet Government is ready to enter immediately into official diplomatic relations with the Government of the new Republic in order to conclude commercial and political agreements."

Before the deluded workers the comedy of "recognition" of the "Far-Eastern Republic" was played in the most brazen fashion: "R.S.F.S.R., the first to recognize the political independence of the Far-Eastern Republic, was the first to enter into the closest economic ties with it." (*Yearly Report of the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs to the IX Congress of Soviets,* R. 1920-1921, 57)

The Lenin regime officially signed a number of economic agreements with its lackeys managing the Far-Eastern Republic, "securing" fishing and hunting rights, "renting" territories for fur development, a railroad treaty, and similar "concessions." This was accompanied with cheap lying which fooled not the bourgeoisie but the revolutionary workers. A sample is contained in Chicherin's report regarding the acts of agreement with the "buffer state": "All the above-listed acts, resting on the absolutely correct foundation of international law and representing the diplomatic, political and economic relations between the R.S.F.S.R. and the Far-Eastern Republic serve as a concrete proof of the independence of the Far Eastern Republic. Despite this perfect manifestation, and also despite such a distinct difference in state structure between Soviet Russia and the Far-Eastern Republic which is founded on the principles of private property, Constitutional Assembly and other democratic elements, the foreign powers still cannot reconcile themselves to the peaceful existence of the Far-Eastern Republic. They are making every effort to intervene in its life and even go to the length of threatening its unity and independence. This situation has compelled us occasionally to add our voice of protest to the protests of the friendly Far-Eastern Republic, the more so because such action on the part of the foreign powers is directed through the Far-Eastern Republic against us." (59)

This line of humbug reached its apex when Lenin put on a ventriloquist act through his dummy "republic" at the Washington Conference (Nov. 12, 1921,—Feb. 6, 1922). His "revolutionary" agents presented a "Memorandum of the Special Delegation of the Far Eastern Republic" in which, shamelessly adopting the language of the imperialists, they declared: "Having confidence in the sincerity of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

intentions of the Government of the United States, the Russian people of the Far Eastern Republic and their Government consider it their natural right to present their point of view regarding the situation in the Far Eastern Republic to the Conference and to defend their interests. The desire of the people of the Far Eastern Republic to create normal relations between the two republics, the desire to carry out the will of the Constituent Assembly and the fact that the Washington Conference is discussing Far Eastern Affairs, made the Government of the Far Eastern Republic send its official Plenipotentiary Delegation to the United States." And the delegation expressed hope that the Wall Street government would extend a supporting hand to Lenin's stooges in Siberia: "The Government of the Far Eastern Republic hopes that with the support of the Government of the United States all the vital problems of the Republic will be settled in a manner favorable to the interests of the people of the Republic."

However, this sugar-coated language failed to impress the American imperialists. Discerning the Lenin regime behind the mask of the Far Eastern Republic, they denied the Kremlin messengers admission to the Washington Conference which was restricted to capitalist representatives.

By the Fall of 1922 the "buffer" had served its purpose and Lenin rang down the curtain on this farce: "The Japanese evacuation continued, however, and on the 25 of October the last Japanese troops left Vladivostok which was occupied by the troops of the Far Eastern Republic. Three weeks later, on November 13, the People's Assembly of the Far Eastern Republic trimphantly declared itself dissolved, and affiliation was effected with Soviet Russia. Having performed its political mission of a buffer, the Far Eastern Republic ceased to exist." *(Gr. S. E.* XX, 236-7)

The chests of Lenin and other Russian burocrats swelled with true Russian chauvinism when the report came that the troops of their General Bluecher entered Vladivostok. "Vladivostok is far away, but it is our town!" Lenin said at the Moscow Soviet with a touch of genuine nationalist pride and affection. *(Wks.* XXVII, R. 362; *Pravda,* Nov. 21, 1922). Lenin used the word "nashensky"—our, an expression employed in the Tsarist days by uneducated patriotic peasants. And Trotsky wrote in *Pravda* of October 25, 1922, a day after the Japanese had left Vladivostok: "Russia has regained its exit to the Pacific." Trotsky did not notice that by making this statement three weeks before the official liquidation of the Far Eastern Republic he virtually brought into the open the fact that the story of the "independence" of the "buffer" known as the Far Eastern Republic was a revolting masquerade. With cynical frankness the Bolshevik *Krasnaya Gazeta* divulged that such precisely was the case: "The buffer has outlived itself. History will forgive us this necessitated masquerade . . ." (Nov. 11, 1922)

When the Lenin burocrats ended their two-year manipulation

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

with the "Constituent Assembly" they turned upon the Siberian Mensheviks and SRs and quite shamelessly denounced them for employing the slogan for Constituent Assembly. The Military Revolutionary Committee headed by V. Smirnov declared: "In their unprincipled policy they utilized all slogans—from Constituent Assembly to the slogan of reestablishment of the black monarchy." (*Japanese Intervention 1918-1922 in Documents*, R. 125)

The fact that Lenin had concretely applied the slogan of "Constituent Assembly" in the Far East was, of course, completely covered up.

2. *Lenin Promoting an Imperialist War*

Lenin's pre-October denunciation of the imperialist war has been a tradition among revolutionary workers. He appeared to take passionately to heart the tragedy of the masses who were sacrificed by the Tsar and the Western imperialists on the battlefields. No worker knew, however, that Lenin's compassion was sheer pretense and that before 1914 he actually wished for an imperialist war. In a letter to Gorky in January 1913 he said: "War of Austria with Russia would be a very useful thing for the revolution (in all Eastern Europe), but there is little likelihood that Franz Joseph and Nicholasha will afford us this pleasure." (*Len. Sbor.* I. 131)

Sometime after Lenin maneuvered the Second Congress of Soviets out of power and settled down in the palace of the Tsar he, instead of merely wishing, actually devised a *policy* of inciting different imperialist powers against one another while seeking peace with all of them. By bringing about a new butchery of millions of workers and peasants he hoped to divert the imperialists from attacking "Socialism" in Russia. His specific perspective was to stir up a war between the United States and Japan. Speaking before the nuclei secretaries of the Moscow Party section on November 26, 1920 Lenin revealed his innermost scheme: "Japan has seized China, which has a population of four hundred million and the richest coal reserves in the world. How can this plum be retained? It is absurd to think that a stronger capitalism will not deprive a weaker capitalism of everything the latter has plundered. Can the Americans remain indifferent under such circumstances? Can strong capitalists be left by the side of weak capitalists and be expected not to seize what they can. What could they be good for in that case? But in such a state of affairs, can we, as Communists, remain indifferent and merely say: 'We shall carry on propaganda for Communism in these countries.' That is true, but that is not all. The practical task of Communist policy is to take advantage of this hostility and to incite one against the other." (*S. W.* VIII, 283-284)

Lenin of course had to offer justification for such a criminal attitude toward the masses of America and Japan. He presented his war-incitement scheme as being in the interests of Socialism and draped

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

himself and his fellow-burocrats in a protective "Socialist" mantle: "But we Communists must use one country against another. Are we not committing a crime against Communism? No, because we are doing so as a socialist state . . ." *(Ib.)*

Nor was Lenin's line of inciting the United States and Japan against each other mere talk. He took some concrete steps to achieve his end. During the early period of the "buffer" farce he had a very friendly semi-private discussion with an American capitalist Vanderlip. Lenin offered him concessions in Kamchatka which at the moment was in the proximity of Japanese sphere of power. Lenin said in his November 26, 1920 speech before the Bolsheviks: "We must take advantage of the situation that has arisen; that is the whole purpose of the Kamchatka concessions." *(Ib)*. A glance at a map of that period will show that between Kamchatka and European Russia lay the "buffer." It would appear completely illogical for Lenin to be giving concessions in the territory of another independent foreign country. But he maneuvered his "buffer" stooges into making an appropriate renunciation of any claim to Kamchatka. In a booklet submitted to the United States Government, the Delegation of the Far Eastern Republic stated: "Kamchatka and a larger part of the Okhotsk coast do not belong to the territory of the Far Eastern Republic." *(Fisheries of the Far Eastern Republic,* 4)

For a moment it appeared to Lenin that his war-incitement scheme would be crowned with success. "We have already set Japan and America at loggerheads, to put it crudely, and have thereby gained an advantage." *(S. W.* VIII, 286)

At each turn Lenin resorted to sophistry in order to justify his policy. "If we are obliged to tolerate such scoundrels as the capitalist thieves, each of whom is preparing to plunge a knife into us, it is our direct duty to make them turn their knives against each other." (288)

Did Lenin understand that the war which he strove to ignite would mean a gigantic slaughter of the masses? Without a doubt: "Japan and America are on the eve of war, and there exists no possibility to hold back that war, in which there will be yet ten million killed and twenty million crippled." (XXV, R. 57). And Lenin told the Bolsheviks that it was their *direct duty* to bring this about! He was simply betraying one more revolutionary principle which in the pre-October days he had pretended to defend against Kautsky and other leaders of the Second International. In April 1917 in his farewell letter to the Swiss workers Lenin declared: "We are opposed to imperialist wars over the division of spoils among the capitalists." Now, throwing off the pretense, he was not only heartily wishing for an imperialist war, as in 1913, but *instigating* one. And Lenin pretended he was performing a genuine service for the masses in endeavoring to make the Far East and the Pacific the graves for ten million Japanese and American toilers!

An even earlier symptom of Lenin's line, which in 1920 ripened

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

into "our direct duty to make them turn their knives against each other," is visible in Lenin's "Theses on Peace" (January 1918). He envisaged then the following picture as a result of his Brest policy: "On the one side there will be the bourgeois society engaged in a strife between two coalitions of confessed plunderers, and on the other side a Socialist Soviet republic living in peace."

And when the butchery of 1914-1919 was over, Lenin offered some concessions in Kamchatka with the intention of inflaming the atmosphere in order to bring about a new imperialist conflagration. Lenin was no doubt gratified to see his policy beginning to take root. Several weeks after he had disclosed to the Moscow Party secretaries his basic aim behind the Kamchatka concessions, Rosta, the Bolshevik news agency, reported from London: "Japan has addressed a note of protest to all powers concerning concessions in Kamchatka granted by the Soviet Government to American concerns." *(Pet. Pravda,* Dec. 29, 1920)

If no mass butchery of the American and Japanese workers materialized it was no fault of Lenin's. He did what he could to provoke it. But the militarists of Japan, burdened with heavy expenditures incurred in their adventures in Siberia, China and Korea, and not at all certain about their British ally, swallowed their mortification, withdrew from Shantung and Siberia and yielded island privileges demanded by the American imperialists.

In connection with Lenin's policy of inciting imperialists to war it is apropos to observe an interesting distinction between Lenin and the reactionary labor leaders in the capitalist world. When the war of 1914-1918 came, all the Hendersons, Plekhanovs and Gomperses gave their enthusiastic support to the mass slaughter, each urging the workers to back their respective capitalist masters. But no one of these Socialist and Labor enemies of the masses ever set before the workers as their *task and duty* the provoking of an imperialist war!

3. *Lenin Offers a Plan to Help Rebuild World Capitalism*

As a direct result of the World War and the elimination of Russia from the capitalist structure, European capitalism lay in ruins. The decomposition and break-up of the entire industrial and commercial fabric of the former Central Empires, the shattering of the world market and the resultant general crisis of inflation in some countries, collapse of prices in others, mass unemployment with the workers at a point of desperation, severely taxed the ingenuity and resources of the victorious imperialist camp.

To meet the critical situation the Supreme Council of the victorious imperialist powers in January 1922 resolved to call a general conference at Genoa to attempt solve the problem of the economic restoration of Europe. The Lenin Government was invited to send a delegation. Indeed, the bourgeois statesmen were very anxious to have Lenin himself present at the Conference. While Briand, the chairman

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Supreme Council, sent the official invitation, Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Facta, Premier of Italy went so far as "to address a personal message to Lenin with the friendly and urgent advice that he agree to the proposal and come to Genoa." (Lenin, XXVII, R. "Notes," 521). Lenin, on his part, hoped to meet the imperialist leaders, specifically Lloyd George (171-172). But for some reason, perhaps illness, Lenin, though officially the head of the Soviet Delegation, remained at home.

The Genoa Conference opened on April 10, 1922. The Sovnarkom's Delegation, through its chairman, Chicherin, informed the imperialist gentlemen of the aims which prompted the Delegation's presence at their Conference: "First of all, it deems it necessary to declare that it has arrived here in the interests of peace and the general reestablishment of the economy of Europe shattered by the long war and the post-war politics." *(Materials on the Genoa Conference,* R. 78)

Lenin, before October, had ruled out in his writings any idea of collaborating or negotiating with the imperialists. In that light Chicherin's declaration was *conscious* counter-revolution.

The policy of offering to work with the capitalists to reestablish their European economy had been formulated by Lenin himself about a year and a half earlier. On November 26, 1920, speaking to the Moscow Party Nuclei Secretaries, he had outlined his idea of presenting the imperialists with a plan to restore world capitalist economy. Lenin avoided saying openly that he offered the plan to the imperialist bourgeoisie and instead used the euphemistic phrase "to the world" as a cloak:

"In order to restore world economy, Russian raw material must be utilized . . . And Russia now comes forward and declares to the world: We undertake to restore international economy—here is our plan. This is economically correct. During this period the Soviet power has grown stronger; and not only has it grown stronger, but it comes forward with a plan for the restoration of the whole world economy. The rehabilitation of international economy with a plan of electrification rests on a scientifically correct basis. With our plan we shall most certainly attract the sympathy not only of the workers but also of sensible capitalists, irrespective of the fact that for them we are 'these terrible Bolshevik terrorists,' and so forth. Our economic plan is therefore a correct one, and when they read this plan, the whole petty-bourgeois democracy will waver to our side; for the imperialists have already fallen out among themselves, while here a plan is being put forward to which the engineers and the economists can have nothing to object. We are passing to the realm of economy and are proposing a positive constructive programme to the whole world." *(S. W.* VIII, 291)

Of course, much preliminary spadework had to be done by Lenin's emissaries in the back-stage talks with the imperialist spokes-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

men before the plan could be offered to them. The start had been made by Krasin who went to London at the time the British Trade Union Delegation headed by Dr. Guest came to visit the Bolshevik burocracy: "The arrival of Comrade Krasin in London marked the beginning of a new period of our relations with England and our international relations in general. The slogan of Lloyd George—peace and trade, the former slogan of the overwhelming majority of business circles of England and even of the labor organizations was also our slogan." *(Materials on G. C.* 16). The secret methods of diplomacy practiced by the Lenin regime evoked a protest in the Bolshevik Party. But the protestors were rebuked. With rare impudence Lenin's burocrats presented the secrecy with which Krasin, Kamenev, Litvinov and other Bolshevik diplomats pursued their private conferences with the imperialists as "revolutionary conspiratory" tactics! "Comrade Osinsky almost talked himself to a point of protest against 'secret diplomacy', although it is clear to everybody that the revolutionary conspiratory rules cannot be abolished as yet." (Editorial Staff, *Pravda,* Dec. 26, 1920)

We see from the material presented that the friendly invitation Lloyd George and other imperialists extended to Lenin was not an accident. Many months before the Genoa Conference the European bourgeoisie was fully convinced that the Bolshevik leaders did not want world revolution but sought trade and amicable relations with the imperialists and sincerely desired to reestablish the badly shattered foundation of capitalism in Europe. In October 1921 Trotsky reported what the bourgeoisie was saying: "It says: with them, with the Bolsheviks, it is possible to establish relations, possible to approach the problem of restoring the shattered economic basis, possible to enter into economic relations because that danger is not all deadly and immediate." *(Pravda,* Oct. 25, 1921)

The man who had won the Russian workers on the program of doing away with the merchant profession now announced himself to have become a merchant: "We say to the powers: 'We, as merchants, are establishing relations.' " *(S. W.* IX, 311). And in truth Lenin not only talked but acted like one. At the Eleventh Congress of the Party on March 27, 1922 he stated: "Needless to say, we are going to Genoa not as Communists, but as merchants." (325). This was a new language in the Bolshevik Party, different not only from the one Lenin had used in 1914-1917 but even from that of 1921. Many delegates at the Eleventh Congress did not like it, and Riazanov expressed his dislike openly—but, of course, politely: "And when Comrade Lenin tells us: We are going to the Genoa Conference not as Communists but as merchants, then I think Comrade Lenin will agree that maybe it would be better if we went there as both Communists and merchants." *(Sten. Rep.* 72). But Lenin was not interested in disguising himself as a Communist when dealing with the imperialists.

That Lenin's position for the Bolsheviks to become commercially

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and financially bourgeois-minded was not a mere incident but a fundamental line is seen from the fact that the poisoning of the workers with the spirit of capitalist acquisitiveness unfolded in the Bolshevik State in 1922 and by the end of the year, under the direction of the Trio-Trotsky alliance, acquired a very ugly form. The following addressed to the workers in connection with a new piece of anti-proletarian policy—State lottery—proves this point: "When you save you money in goods you only save your money. When you save in the lottery loan—you save money, receive interest and may win a large amount of money." *(Krasnaia Gazeta,* Dec. 31, 1922)

However, Lenin was not merely concerned with lending a hand to financial magnates in their desperate strait. With Lenin, *Russia—his Russia*—came first. Russia was paramount whether the situation involved his attitude towards the world bourgeoisie or the world proletariat. Chicherin presented Lenin's concept of Russia's participation in the work of stabilizing capitalism: "The problem of reestablishing world economy in the present circumstance is so immeasurable and vast that it can be solved only through a sincere desire on the part of all European and non-European countries to coordinate their activity and to be prepared, if necessary, to bear temporary sacrifices. The economic reestablishment of Russia, the largest country in Europe, which possesses innumerable stores of natural wealth, is the prerequisite condition for the general economic reconstruction." *(Materials on the Genoa Conference,* 79)

Thus Lenin's foreign policy had three basic aspects. By exploiting the friction between America and Japan he endeavored to ward off military danger to Russia; by concerning himself with the imperialist problem of reestablishing the capitalist economy of Europe he aimed to ward off the danger of world proletarian-democratic revolution; by the same token he wished to obtain financial means for developing the productive resources of Russia.

The Genoa Conference seethed with haggling and scheming as the capitalist and the Bolshevik merchants endeavored to outwit one another. The imperialists asked Chicherin to recognize the pre-October debts. Chicherin agreed to meet the obligations of the Tsarist and the Kerensky Governments, but made a counter-claim of two billion gold francs for damages caused by the imperialist intervention and assistance to the White Armies. Above all, the Bolshevik Delegation requested an international loan. The imperialists replied that the Lenin regime must first pay the foreign capitalists for confiscated property and effect certain political and economic changes in Russia. At length, on May 11, 1922, after a month of bargaining, the imperialists refused to advance a loan and Lenin's Delegation withdrew all concessions. A week later the Genoa Conference adjourned.

While the Genoa Conference was on, a part of the Bolshevik Delegation ran off to Rapallo, a town near Genoa, and concluded a treaty with the German bourgeoisie. Cancelling all mutual claims and

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

debts, both sides pledged reciprocal assistance in the rehabilitation of economy, and, as it became known afterward, actually formed a limited military alliance. This was eventually divulged by Trotsky: "the treaty of Rapallo (April, 1922), when an economic and partially military collaboration was established between Moscow and Berlin . . ." *(New Int.* Oct. 1942). Thus, it was not Stalin but Lenin who began what was to develop into a series of military alliances of the Bolshevik State with various capitalist powers.

4. *Lenin's Struggle for the Dardanelles*

Previous Russian governments, whether headed by the Romanovs or by Kerensky, kept within the orbit of their foreign policy the issue of the Dardanelles, the gateway from the Black Sea to the Mediterranean. The Bolshevik burocrats, pursuing the Russian nationalist road, were infected with the disease of Great Russian expansionism. The adventure in Iran was a definite proof of this. And, being a *Russian* regime, the Lenin government sooner or later was certain to come upon the problem of the Dardanelles.

Following the defeat of the White Armies and the close of the Polish war, the eyes of the Lenin regime fell on Turkey. The Kremlin rulers were interested not in the Turkish workers and peasants nor in the brutally oppressed Armenian and other masses but in the military dictator, Mustapha Kemal Pasha, who in various ways was continuing resistance to the Allies. Many years after Trotsky was out of the Soviet Union he placed the bloody Turkish dictator in the same class with Diaz, for a quarter of a century dictator over Mexico, and with Stalin: "[We come] closer to an understanding of Stalin [when we think in terms of] Mustapha Kemal Pasha or perhaps Porfirio Diaz." *(Stalin,* 413. Brackets by the editor of *Stalin)*

The brutal Turkish dictator kept many revolutionary workers rotting in his dungeons and he butchered not a few of them. But the "leader of the world revolution" and his associates, while shedding a tear or two over those unfortunates, as they did in the case of the Finnish, Ukrainian and other revolutionary workers in 1918, were concerned with their own "practical" matters. After the termination of the World War, the Dardanelles were occupied by the Allies. Lenin felt it would be desirable to have Turkey, an infinitely weaker power, to resume control over the Straits. Support to the military government of Kemal Pasha, therefore, was the logical policy of the Sovnarkom. In cultivating the friendship of Kemal and closely identifying itself with his "cause" of regaining possession of Constantinople and the Straits, the Lenin burocracy had to be mindful of the Russian Communist workers. Therefore it sprinkled some pink-colored holy "revolutionary" water on the Kemal dictatorship. The People's Commissar for Nationalities, Stalin, speaking at the meeting of the Baku Soviet on the third anniversary of the October Revolution, said: "We possess

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a revolutionary core which rallies to itself all the other colonies and semi-colonies represented by the government of Kemal, which though bourgeois-revolutionary, none the less fights the Entente arms in hand. While three years ago we did not even dare to dream of a stir in the East, we now not only have a revolutionary core of the East represented by a bourgeois-revolutionary Turkey, but likewise possess a socialist organ of the East—The Committee of Action and Propaganda." *(Kommunist,* Baku, Nov. 11, 1920; Stalin, *October Revolution,* 45)

If the regime of the nationalist adventurer Kuchuk Khan, which worked with the rich classes in Gilan, could be portrayed as "The first toilers republic of the East," there was nothing to prevent the Lenin burocracy from presenting the first Fascist regime in the East as the "revolutionary core" of the East! The portrayal of reactionary Turkey as revolutionary was not a careless slip of the tongue for it had been earlier employed by Stalin at the Regional Conference of the Communist Organization of the Don and Caucasus on October 27, 1920: "The revolutionary movement in the East against the Entente is growing, crystallizing its core personified by revolutionary Turkey . . ." *(Oct. Rev.* 35). And as Lenin and Kemal Pasha drew closer to each other, the Bolshevik press equated their two regimes: "At this moment negotiations are being carried on between the Soviet and the Turkish revolutionary governments." *(Izvestia,* March 6, 1921)

Having arrived at an understanding with Kemal Pasha, the Lenin diplomats demanded that the Allies fulfill their war promise to Nicholas II to deliver Constantinople and the Dardanelles to Russia, implying that the Lenin regime would then turn the Straits over to Kemal. Joffe spoke before an assembly of Bolshevik burocrats: "We were saying: 'Turn over to us Constantinople, the Dardanelles, turn over everything that was promised Russia in the event of victory of the Entente which really did come out victorious. You have profited and are profiting from the results of victory. We, of course, will not keep Constantinople for ourselves, nor other territories, because we are no imperialists, but we can dispose of them in our own, not in your way. Maybe we shall return them to those nations to whom they really belong, but that is none of your affairs. If you demand that we pay you for all that you delivered to us during the war, for that which factually was given to Russia in order that it might continue the war and was used up during the war, then, apart from the fact that we can prove the complete worthlessness of your deliveries, it is necessary to total up the other side of the balance.' To this Lloyd George replied jokingly: 'Well, we shall see, maybe some day we'll give you Constantinople.' Then we replied: 'Well, we shall see, maybe some day we'll pay you the debts, but so far we absolutely do not recognize those war debts due to the reasons indicated.' (Laughter)." (A. A. Joffe, *From Genoa to Hague,* R. 12)

Upon Kemal's successful defense of Turkey in a war with Greece,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Allies called a Conference in Lausanne to solve the problems involving Turkey and other powers. On December 1, 1922 a group of Bolshevik diplomats arrived at Lausanne and was allowed to take part in the discussion of the Dardanelles. Quite naturally the Turkish government sold out to the British on the issue of the Straits, and Chicherin, deserted by "the revolutionary core of the East," faced the imperialists single-handed. "The most acute question at the Conference, as should have been expected, turned out to be the question of the Straits, though Turkey, desiring to secure compensation in other matters, immediately made it understood that it yielded to the British on the issue of the Straits. Therefore, the discussion of the question of the Straits factually assumed the form of a duel between the head of the Soviet delegation, G. V. Chicherin, and the representative of the Entente, Lord Curzon." (Lenin, XXVII, R. "Notes" 549)

Having placed their foreign policy during the Brest period on the grounds of imperialist legality, the Kremlin rulers, understandably, made a frantic effort to wring from Curzon some sort of concession even if it were a paper one. Curzon, quite at home on the plane of diplomacy, stood cold against Chicherin's ardent chatter. "The position of the Entente on that question boiled down to the demand of maintaining the Straits open to all warships both in times of peace and of war. Self-evident, this demand was directed with all its sharpness against the Soviet republics, and at the same time unquestionably violated the sovereignty of Turkey. The Soviet Delegation, when departing for Lausanne, had been given directives of the opposite character. It was instructed to insist on the complete closing of the Straits to warships of all powers except Turkey." *(Ib.)*. Neither side would budge, and the Bolshevik merchants returned to Moscow without any gains.

The Lausanne Conference marked the last important moment in Lenin's guidance of foreign policy. On December 16, 1922 he suffered the second stroke and when he partly recovered a week later he turned his attention exclusively to the task of dislodging his former favorite from the control mechanism of the burocratic apparatus. From the end of 1922 till 1925 Bolshevik foreign policy was directed by the Trio and Trotsky. In the period of the ordeal of the Chinese masses and of the Russian opposition workers, the diplomatic staff was operated largely by outstanding Trotskyites under the supervision of Stalin. Later the foreign policy was conducted by Stalin and his flunkey Litvinov; eventually by Stalin and his lick-spittles, Molotov and Vishinsky. The aims Stalin pursued since the close of 1922 were invariably the nationalist Russian laid down by Lenin from Brest to Lausanne—"peace" and trade with imperialism, securance of imperialist recognition, the playing of one capitalist power against another, the building of puppet regimes on the perimeter of the Russian Bolshevik State, and the seeking of a measure of control of the Dardanelles.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XXII.

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL UNDER LENIN A TOOL OF THE RUSSIAN BUROCRACY

1. *The Betrayal of the Revolutionary Workers of Berlin*

INVESTED WITH the prestige of having led the masses in the overthrow of the Russian bourgeoisie, Lenin cast an irresistible spell over the subjectively revolutionary workers of all countries. The Bolshevik leadership was regarded as the authority on tactics and strategy of world revolution. And indeed, there were no people as conscious of what tactic would be correct or incorrect for the proletariat as Lenin and Trotsky.

On December 30, 1918 the group led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg (The Spartacans) united with some other Left elements and formed the Communist Party of Germany. Giving dramatic emphasis to the event, Lenin declared that the Third International was now a reality: "When the 'Spartacus Union' assumed the name of 'Communist Party of Germany,' the foundation of the truly proletarian, truly international, truly revolutionary Third International, the Communist International, became a fact. Formally this foundation has not yet been registered, but factually the Third International already exists." ("Letter to the Workers of Europe and America," *C. W.* XVI, R. 6)

The Communist Party of Germany did not throw a searching light on Brest and on the burocratic character of the Bolshevik leadership. What was more, its leaders failed to put forth even the basic positions contained in Lenin's 1917 program: abolition of all armies, absolute exclusion of appointment method of power, elections and recall from below, revolutionary war, proletarian control of economy, abolition of all burocracy. The Bukharin Left Communists, the Democratic Centralists and the Workers Opposition, though far from a correct program, were infinitely closer to it than the Spartacans.

Early in January 1919 the Communist Party of Germany, but a week old, flung a challenge to the Social Democratic government of Germany, took up arms and pitted its small forces against overwhelming odds. The tragic result of the putsch was the massacre of several thousand vanguard workers of Germany and the murder of their leaders, Liebknecht and Luxemburg.

Viewed in the light of the supreme caution that Lenin had pursued in the Kerensky period, the Spartacus uprising in January 1919 was not a move to lead the masses against Capitalism, but an ultra-Leftist act of what seemed as raging political lunacy. The 1919 situation in Germany was quite different from what it had been in January 1918 during the Brest 'negotiations.' At that time the masses, driven by the ordeal of war and hunger, had ranged themselves against the Kaiser Government which was unbending in its resolve to go on pouring out blood for the sake of imperialist conquest. So great had the anti-war sentiment of the German masses been in 1918 that even

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Kaiser Socialists, led by Scheidemann, were constrained to threaten the Imperial regime. Now, however, the chief cause of the 1918 discontent, the seemingly interminable slaughter on the battlefields, no longer existed. There was widespread famine in Germany, but the American bourgeoisie, which manifested confidence in the Majority Socialist regime, proceeded at once to organize relief. Repelled by the horrible consequences of the Brest "breathing spell" in Russia, the German working class turned in a tidal wave to the Ebert Majority Socialist regime. Three weeks before the Spartacan putsch, on December 16, 1918, the delegates from Workers and Soldiers Soviets throughout Germany met in Berlin. The overwhelming majority backed not the Communist Party but the Ebert regime. Only an infinitesimal portion of the German masses succumbed to the fable that the Lenin burocracy led the international proletariat to Socialism. They poured out their blood in the streets of Berlin imagining they were sacrificing themselves for the world revolution.

There are certain aspects of this terrible, suicidal ultra-Leftist uprising which have been shrouded in mystery. Did Liebknecht and Luxemburg themselves initiate the ultra-Left twist for the infant Communist Party of Germany or did some invisible hand push them onto that path of ruin?

Two months before the Berlin putsch, in November 1918, when the German Imperial Government fell, the Spartacus leaders who had been imprisoned for opposing the war were released. At a general meeting of Left elements in Berlin it was decided that Liebknecht visit the Bolshevik Embassy. Whom he saw in the Embassy we have been unable to ascertain. On November 22, 1918, pursuing an ultra-Left, putschist line, the Spartacans made an effort to seize the police headquarters in Berlin. This wild action set a distinct pattern for the tactics of the entire forthcoming period. A month later, on December 23, Spartacan sailors arrived in Berlin and captured and attempted to hold the royal palace and stables.

Since the whole world was informed of these events, it is plain that Lenin could not have failed to observe that the Spartacans were falling into ultra-Leftist quicksand which could bring only disorganization, demoralization and bleeding to the proletarian vanguard. Be it borne in mind that when Lenin came forward as the organizer of the Third or Communist International he thereby assumed the official role of guide to the international proletariat. But this burocratic "leader of the world revolution" and his aides, while pouring out voluminous writings on purely internal Russian problems and on proletarian revolution *in the abstract,* did not issue a single document concretely warning the German revolutionary workers to avoid ultra-Leftist quicksands. Yet Lenin had had experience in such matters. Back in May 1917, when a Note by the Provisional Government to the Allies announcing the policy of continuation of the war caused an explosion of indignation among the Russian workers, several Petro-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

grad Bolsheviks issued the slogan 'Down with the Provisional Government.' Lenin quickly grasped that the slogan was premature, was slightly Leftist, because the Menshevik and SR majority in the Soviets supported the Provisional Government and the masses still followed the Mensheviks and SRs. He criticized the Bolshevik Petrograd Committee very sharply: "We say that the slogan, 'Down with the Provisional Government' is an adventurer's slogan; that the government cannot as yet be overthrown. That is why we have advocated peaceful demonstrations. All we wanted was a peaceful reconnoitering of the enemy's forces; we did not want to give battle. The Petrograd Committee, however, turned a trifle to the Left. In a case of this sort, such a step was a grave crime." *(C. W.* XX, Bk I, 285-6). It is important to note that in his extreme cautiousness Lenin for the moment even suspended his slogan of turning the imperialist war into a civil war. (279). His attitude toward the Spartacans was totally different. In January 1919 the Spartacans issued the Left slogan "down with the Ebert-Scheidemann Government." They formed a united "Revolutionary Committee" with Ledebour, leader of the Independent Social Democrats, foes of proletarian revolution, and burst into suicidal ultra-Leftist violence. Lenin's reaction to this wild ultra-Leftism constitutes incriminating evidence. He wrote: "The entire march of development of the German revolution and especially the struggle of the 'Spartacans,' i.e. the true and only representatives of the proletariat, against the union of the traitorous scoundrels, the Scheidemanns and Sudekums with the bourgeoisie, all that shows clearly how the question is posed by history with regard to Germany: 'Soviet power' or bourgeois parliament no matter under what signs ('National' or 'Constitutional' Assembly) it presents itself." *(C. W.* XVI, R. 7)

No statement could have been more treacherous from one who obviously knew better. It was not difficult to gauge the reaction of the German masses to the disruptive tactics of the Spartacans. On the 19 of January, four days after Liebknecht and Luxemburg were murdered, the masses voted confidence in the government of Ebert and Noske. In the ensuing elections, while the bourgeois parties scored heavily, the Noske butchers of the proletarian vanguard received *over eleven million* votes which gave them the largest representation in the National Assembly. Lenin's line of indicating approval of the Spartacan insane putschism was deliberate sabotage of the correct and effective method of teaching and explaining which he himself had employed in the pre-October 1917 period.

None of the Bolshevik leaders dared, even in a limited way, to admit that the Spartacans had applied an ultra-Leftist putschist tactic and thus highly contributed to the political stabilization of the German bourgeoisie. Both under Lenin and under Stalin the 1919 ultra-Leftist bleeding of the German proletarian vanguard was always pictured as having filled a need in the crystallization of a revolutionary movement in Germany. In its crudest form this was presented by

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Hugo Eberlein who, under the pseudonym Albert, led the Spartacan delegation to the first Congress of the Comintern. Ten years later, a loyal Stalinist, he wrote: "Without the blood shed by the Spartakists for the German proletariat in 1919, a German Communist Party would have been impossible." *(Communist Int.,* Tenth Anniversary Number, 436)

Twenty years later, the Trotskyites, either ignorant of the Lenin-Trotsky line of 1919 or concealing it, wrote with a modicum of truth. "For the Spartacan insurrection of January 1919 was nothing but a completely planless, positively inconceivably naive playing with the fire of insurrection." *(New Int.,* Feb. 1939, 48). It is interesting to note that the line for openly approving the ultra-Left suicidal "battles" of the handful of German Communist workers was advanced in 1919 by no less an astute political authority than Trotsky. Reviewing the issue of the German revolution in the official Bolshevik press, Trotsky posed the question: "At the same time, as though automatically the following question presents itself: aren't the leaders of the movement committing serious tactical mistakes which threaten the whole movement with ruin?" *(Pravda,* April 23, 1919). And the reply of this exalted member of the ruling Kremlin burocracy was: "These erupting strikes, uprisings and battles constitute at the present moment the only accessible form of open mobilization of the forces of the German proletariat liberated from the yoke of the old Party; and at the same time they represent the only method, in the given situation, of educating new leaders and of building the new Party. It is quite obvious that this path entails tremendous exertions and demands innumerable sacrifices. But there is no choice. This is the only path along which the class uprising of the German proletariat can unfold until complete victory." *(Ib.).* Thus Trotsky assured the revolutionary workers they had no other choice but ultra-Leftist, suicidal putschism.

Of all the Bolshevik leaders, Zinoviev came closest to admitting that the "only path" onto which Lenin and Trotsky pushed the German proletarian vanguard in 1919 was not revolutionary. Five years after the events Zinoviev wrote: "Then the Spartacist Union at the beginning of 1919, not having yet gathered sufficient strength took upon its shoulders a task beyond its might when it attempted to organize an armed uprising against the power of the bourgeoisie and Social-Democrats, at a time when the Communists did not have a strong following among the German proletarians." ("The Fifth Anniversary of the Comintern," *The Com. Int.* #1, "Jubilee Number," 91)

The vicious blow which the ultra-Left policy dealt to the proletarian vanguard of Germany struck deep. The German Socialist authorities, justifying their action by the apprehension of further Spartacan outbreaks, and with the support of millions of workers and the utter indifference of millions more, hounded the proletarian vanguard. Discredited in the eyes of the masses, the Communist Party could not even maintain its legality. "Having suffered defeat in the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

January 1919 street battles in Berlin, the Communist Party was temporarily forced to go underground." (Lenin, XVI, R. 527)

On January 24, 1919, a few days after the rising had been suppressed, an appeal written by Trotsky went out from Moscow inviting all the so-called Communist groups to take part in the convocation of the first Congress of a new International. The platform upon which the International was to be founded, it was stated, had been "drawn up in agreement with the program of the Spartacist Union in Germany and of the Communist Party (Bolsheviks) in Russia." ("The Third International to the World's Communists," Cited by R. Palme Dutt in the *Two Internationals,* 64). In the section of the platform titled "Objects and Tactics" the Left line is easily discernible. Since the large masses of Europe were under the influence of Social Democracy, Lenin and Trotsky knew it was out of the question to speak of the immediate seizure of power by the working class. Yet in the platform they declared: "The present tasks of the working class is the immediate seizure of power." *(Ib.).* This line put the isolated Communist workers in most advanced capitalist countries in a putschist frame of mind. Of ultra-Leftist tactical methods such as were applied by the Spartacans, the platform spoke approvingly: "The basis of the Third International is given by the fact that in different parts of Europe there are being formed groups and organizations of people of the same opinion and an identical programme, and making use, on the whole, of the same tactical methods. Such are in the first place the Spartacists in Germany and the Communist Parties in a number of other countries." *(Ib.* 67)

Thus in our investigation we have arrived at the origin of the Comintern zigzags, the method by which first Lenin and Trotsky, and later Stalin consciously disrupted and bled the international proletariat in order to safeguard their burocratic system in Bolshevik Russia. The first zigzag, as we see, was ultra-Leftist, with strong Rightist features. One of these Rightist features was the collaboration with the Independent Social Democrats, with Ledebour, a determined opponent of the overthrow of the bourgeois State, who just a few weeks before the putsch had officially worked with the Scheidemannites. "After the November revolution in Germany he for a time was a member of the Government. In the period of the January 1919 uprising he, together with Liebknecht and Schultze, was a member of the revolutionary committee in Berlin, remaining simultaneously an enemy of the dictatorship of the proletariat and a defender of 'democracy.'" (Lenin, XVII, R. "Notes," 451). Another extremely indicative Rightist feature was the fact that the immediate cause for starting the wild rising was the dismissal of the Independent Social Democratic Police Chief of Berlin.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *Further Proof at the First Congress of the Comintern*

The founding Congress of the Comintern convened in the Kremlin on March 2, 1919. Lenin opend the first session with the request to honor the memory of *two* Spartacans: "First of all, I will ask all those present to rise in honor of the memory of the best representatives of the Third International: Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. *(All rise).*" *(S. W.* X, 26)

Why didn't Lenin add: and the memory of thousands of revolutionary workers of Berlin? Because, translated into plain words, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Zinoviev and the other Bolshevik leaders had established a line of demarcation between leaders and workers, "tops" and "bottoms," and this Russian reality absorbing the mind of the high burocrats, often found reflection in their speeches.

In his political report Lenin went into an explanation of the difference between bourgeois and proletarian democracy, pretending that he practiced the latter, vehemently denounced international Social Democracy and showed that the murder of Liebknecht and Luxemburg confirmed the proposition that the Social Democratic German government was in fact the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. But his voluminous report did not contain a single word of analysis of the suicidal tactics of the Spartacans. This glaring omission is particularly revealing, and damning, in view of the fact that a day before, on March 3, 1919 the Spartacans, still half-suppressed and considerably weakened by the terrible blood-letting of the January butchery, had renewed their putschist activity. From March 5 to 13, 1919 the armed Spartacan workers, joined by a handful of sailors from Kiel, tore frantically through Berlin only to be again bloodily suppressed by the Socialist Minister, Noske. Under whose instructions was the Communist Party of Germany plunged into new ultra-Leftist adventures?

Lenin's knowledge of the situation in Germany was quite comprehensive. Only about a week after the Spartacans were once more brutally crushed in Berlin, Lenin was lecturing Bukharin in a discussion of the Party Program at the Eighth Congress of the R. C. P. "Has the German proletariat become differentiated from the bourgeoisie? No! Why, it was only of a few of the large towns that it was reported that the majority of the workers are opposed to the Scheidemannites." *(S. W.* VIII, 340). Significantly, Lenin explained that the reason for the unity of the German masses with the bourgeoisie was due to the alliance of the Spartacans with the Independent Social Democrats. This was "criticism" of the Right tactic. But against the ulta-Leftist policy of the Spartacans Lenin did not utter a syllable.

To his knowledge that the German proletariat was not differentiated from the bourgeoisie can be added the information he gathered from the Spartacan delegates at the First Congress of the Comintern to the effect that neither the German agricultural laborers nor the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

poor peasants had been organized in Soviets. (XVI, R. 51). Lenin's silence about the wild ultra-Leftist line is conspicuous and obviously was conscious and deliberate.

3. *The 1919 Betrayal of the Hungarian Proletariat*

Though Hungary, after the fall of the Central Empires, was supposedly an all-people's republic ruled by a Social-Democratic-Liberal coalition headed by Count Karolyi, factually it was dominated by the impoverished landed aristocracy and the bankrupt bourgeoisie. The Government floundered hopelessly in a morass of internal and external difficulties. In the national sphere the Social-Democratic ministers, who constituted the majority in the Karolyi Cabinet, won no sympathy from the petty-bourgeoisie because they agreed to relinquish two-thirds of Hungary's territory, with a sizable Magyar population, to Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. Deprived of its vital sources of raw materials and fuel, post-war Hungary economically was a spent cartridge. While the Allied imperialists refrained from occupying Germany, they were preparing to convert Hungary into a military base for the intervention in Russia. Reacting to these conditions which were considerably different from those in Germany, the workers and peasants of Hungary cut themselves away from the Liberals and Social Democrats and turned to the Communists.

The Hungarian Communist Party was formed on November 21, 1918. A small group initially, it made rapid strides in extending its scope of influence and within several weeks became a source of worry to the Social-Democratic-Liberal Government. On February 21, 1919 the Government arrested the leadership of the Party and outlawed its press. However, the desperate tactics of the unpopular regime only aroused extensive sympathy for the Communists.

Suddenly, something utterly unforeseen took place. On March 21, 1919, after the Allied imperialists had presented additional territorial demands to Hungary, the Karolyi Government resigned. On the same day the arrested Communist leaders, Bela Kun and others, were approached by the Social Democrats: "The Social-Democrats decided to come to an agreement with the Communist Party, whose influence among the working class masses was growing from day to day." (Lenin, *S. W.* VIII, "Expl. Notes," 382)

The essence of the deal was capitulation of Bela Kun to Social Democracy. The previous government coalition had consisted of a Social Democratic majority with a Liberal minority; the new regime was also to be composed of a Social-Democratic majority but with a Communist minority. The Communists actually served as figureheads. "Simultaneously and also in accordance with the terms of the agreement, the Communist Party was completely amalgamated with the Social-Democratic Party to form the united Socialist (subsequently Socialist-Communist) Party of Hungary. This was a serious error on

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the part of the Hungarian Communists, for in effect it deprived the proletarian revolution in Hungary of the leadership of the proletarian Communist Party and tied the hands of the Communists. As far as the Social-Democrats were concerned, this amalgamation, like the agreement with the Communists generally, was a dexterous manoeuvre designed to weaken both the Communist Party and the proletarian dictatorship, which the Social-Democrats had so hypocritically recognized, and to disintegrate them from within." *(Ib.)*

In this Stalinist Explanatory Note, as indeed in all the statements of the Bolshevik leaders sometime after the event, the destruction of the Hungarian revolution is traced directly to the capitulation of Bela Kun to Social Democracy. "To betray the revolution, under the guise of recognizing the proletarian dictatorship and coming to an agreement with the Communists, was the motive that underlay the actions of the Social-Democrats, who, with the Communists, occupied the high posts in the new Hungarian Soviet Republic. This betrayal was one of the chief reasons for the collapse of the Hungarian Soviet Republic." *(Ib.)*

The Hungarian Red Army at first successfully defeated the interventionist forces of Rumania and Czechoslovakia. But owing to the internal political work of disintegration, defeat eventually came at the front.

Apart from uniting with the Hungarian Mensheviks Bela Kun copied Trotsky's method of placing the former imperial officers In commanding posts in the Hungarian Red Army. *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* X, 79)

In the end Bela Kun capitulated openly by resigning and handing over all power to the trade union burocracy: "In view of the defeat of the Red Army, the food difficulties, which had been rendered extremely acute by the economic blockade imposed by the Entente, the counter-revolutionary movement within the country, the direct treachery of the Social-Democrats, who were carrying on negotiations with the Entente for the suppression of the Soviet government, and, finally, owing to the hostility of the peasant masses, the Soviet government, on August 1, decided to capitulate and to transfer the power to a 'trade union government' consisting of Social-Democratic trade union burocrats, who immediately restored capitalist private property and the bourgeois state apparatus. A few days later this government was overthrown by the bourgeoisie." (Lenin, *S. W.* VIII "E. N." 385)

The Hungarian "Soviet" regime did not even have a program comparable to Lenin's pre-October promise-platform of elections of officials, recall from below and of other democratic proletarian features. Nobody elected the Hungarian People's Commissars—they assumed power through a horse-deal at the top between the Social-Democratic adherents to Capitalism and the Bela Kun backers of the Russian-nationalist burocracy.

A little over a year later Trotsky uttered these "wise" words: "The Communist Party paid heavily for the revolutionary instability

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and the political treachery of its companions. It is quite obvious that for the Hungarian Communists it would have been more profitable to have come to power later, after having afforded to the Left opportunists the possibility of compromising themselves once and for all." *(Dictatorship vs. Democracy,* 108). Trotsky, naturally, guarded against revealing that the throttling of the Hungarian proletariat had been performed by the Kremlin "leaders of the world revolution." Lenin's attitude is best illustrated by his remarks in the Moscow Soviet two weeks after the formation of the Social Democratic government of Hungary with its Communist facade: "In Hungary the revolution occurred in an unusually original way. The Hungarian Kerensky, who is called there Karolyi, resigned on his own, and the Hungarian compromisers-Mensheviks and SRs understood that they must repair to the prison where the Hungarian Comrade Bela Kun, one of the best Hungarian Communists, was. They came to him and said: 'You'll have to assume power!' The bourgeois government resigned. The bourgeois Socialists, Mensheviks and SRs of Hungary entered into the Party of the Bolsheviks and formed a united Party and a united government. Comrade Bela Kun, our comrade and Communist who fully graduated from the practical course of Bolshevism in Russia, is the main leader. He spoke to me over the radio: 'I do not have a majority in the government but I shall be victorious because the masses are backing me!' " (XVI, R. 178)

It is easy to observe that no uniformity of disruptive technique was practiced by Lenin and Trotsky when they were constructing the Comintern. Pushing the Spartacans to the Leftmost bloody extremes, Lenin on March 19, 1919 had attacked the Rightist feature of the Spartacan policy—"the alliance between the Spartacists and the thrice-accursed German Menshevik-Independents, who make a muddle of everything. . . ." *(S. W.* VIII, 340). But in the case of Hungary Lenin two weeks later extolled the Rightist policy of unity with "the bourgeois Socialists, Mensheviks and SRs" and voiced approval of the majority Social Democratic regime, quite conscious that this regime would do its utmost to restore the normal bourgeois power. To strengthen the chains which bound the masses to their betrayers, Lenin, two months after the formation of the Social-Democratic-Communist regime in Hungary, in an article "Greetings to the Hungarian Workers," wrote: "Comrades Hungarian workers! You have given the world even a better example than Soviet Russia in that you have been able at once to unite all socialists on the platform of genuine proletarian dictatorship." *(C. W.* XVI, R. 228)

Lenin did not merely let the Hungarian revolution perish by default; he made his own example of independence from Menshevism count for little and told the Hungarian workers that Bela Kun's subordination to Social Democracy was "a better example." Of course, when the Hungarian White Guards butchered the Communist workers and terror stalked through the towns and villages, Lenin "criti-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cized" the line of the Hungarian Communist Party. The Second Congress of the Comintern, held under his direct political guidance, stated: "No Communist should forget the lesson of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. The unity between the Hungarian Communists and the so-called Left Social Democrats cost the Hungarian proletariat very dearly." *(Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International,* 27)

Unfortunately, hardly a single Communist worker remembered that "the leader of the world revolution" himself had applauded and enthusiastically endorsed Bela Kun's deadly policy.

4. *Lenin's Rightist Pamphlet*

None of Lenin's works won greater respect and affection of the Stalinist burocrats during the long periods of Rightist policy than the pamphlet *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder.* The work became one of their most effective instruments in launching "united front" maneuvers designed to attach the advanced workers to Social Democracy, Liberals and even to Monarchists and Fascists. Lenin produced the pamphlet in the period of the arrival of the British Delegation in Russia and Krasin's trip to England. The Rightist swing embodied in that pamphlet is discernible in Lenin's approval of the decision of the leaders of the Communist Party of Germany to become a *loyal* opposition to a Social-Democratic government. Discussing that decision, the pamphlet declared: "Its basic premise is that there is no 'objective basis' at the present moment for the dictatorship of the proletariat, in view of the fact that 'the majority of the urban workers' support the Independents. The conclusion is: the promise to be a 'loyal opposition,'(i.e. renunciation of preparations for a violent overthrow') to a 'Socialist government if it excluded bourgeois-capitalist parties.' Undoubtedly, these tactics, in the main, are correct." *(S. W.* X. 150)

With Lenin's blessings, the German Communist leadership put its decision into practice. "The Communists in Saxony have supported the minority government of the Social Democrats since 1920." *(Inprecor,* Jan. 17, 1924, 19)

Seemingly an exhaustive analysis of Leftism, the pamphlet did not contain a single word of comment on the ultra-Leftist Spartacan policy of wild armed adventures against the capitalist State. Nor did it contain a word about Trotsky's criminal thesis that the German proletariat had no other choice. Launching some criticism against secondary Leftist features, Lenin concealed the fact that he and Trotsky had given a blanket endorsement to the *entire* ultra-Leftist policy of the Spartacans.

The central Rightist feature in Lenin's pamphlet was the policy of support to the Labor Party agents of British imperialism.

Lenin painted an alluring picture: the British revolutionary

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

workers would help the Hendersons and MacDonalds to power. Then the Hendersons and MacDonalds would expose themselves, and the British masses would swing to the support of the Communists. The Hendersons, he assured the workers, were *afraid* to take power! "We must, first, help Henderson or Snowden to beat Lloyd George and Churchill (or to be more correct: to compel the former to beat the latter, because the former are *afraid to win!*" (*S. W.* X. 128). To make this myth sound logical, Lenin introduced a supposed analogy from the Russian experience in 1917. "We said to the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries: Take complete power without the bourgeoisie, because you have the majority in the Soviets (at the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets in June 1917, the Bolsheviks had only 13 per cent of the votes). But the Russian Hendersons and Snowdens feared to take power without the bourgeoisie." (129)

A closer view will expose this "analogy." In 1917 there was a dynamic institution covering all Russia, the Soviets. Had the Mensheviks and SRs agreed to take power through the Soviets and, therefore, establish a *Soviet* form of government, they would have been placed in the position of liquidating the bourgeois Provisional Government. The shift would have meant a sharp turn to the Left for these political supporters of the bourgeoisie and for the masses. With the Soviets standing as the *sole* authority, the mass movement would have swept over landlord and bourgeois property like a cyclone. It was in dread of such an eventuality that the Russian "Hendersons" stubbornly fought against the slogan *All Power to the Soviets.* Their line was to consolidate the gains of the bourgeoisie on the basis of a parliamentary regime. If, during Kronstadt, the SRs, Milukov and even the Monarchists were ready to support a *Soviet* form, it was because the Russian bourgeois government had long been overthrown and in the context of the Kronstadt situation they saw no other starting point for the return to a parliamentary form and eventually to a White Guard dictatorship. But in England, as Lenin knew very well, there were no Soviets and no *provisional* bourgeois government. His analogy was fraudulent from top to bottom. In England the whole ancient bourgeois-parliamentary structure with its royalist trappings stood intact, and the British imperialist politicians attired in Labor garb not only did not fear but were fully prepared to relieve the Liberal and Conservative imperialist politicians at the first critical moment.

Conforming with Lenin's directives the British Communist leaders adopted a pro-Labor Party orientation—with "criticism."

To the revolutionary workers the Rightist line of support to the Hendersons and MacDonalds was rendered palatable by Lenin's "analogy" of a rope supporting a hanged man. The Communist workers thrilled to the idea of giving such support to Henderson, not grasping that in reality Lenin was inducing them to give *political* support to British imperialism. Equally, the Communist workers took

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a benign view of uniting with the British Mensheviks—for Lenin and Trotsky themselves set an example in this respect. In his speech at the Congress of Workers in the Leather Industry, on October 2, 1920, Lenin announced: "The march on Poland brought about such a change that the English Mensheviks entered into an alliance with the Russian Bolsheviks." *(Lenin on Britain,* 205)

The Labor Party burocrats actually took office and operated the political bourgeois system of Britain, but this did not in the least expose them.

5. *Protection through "Confessions" of Kremlin's Puppets*

The process of burocratic centralism in the Bolshevik Party found its inevitable complement in the Comintern. An important step in tightening Russian control was taken at the Second Congress (July 17—August 7, 1920). The "Statutes of the Communist International," point 8, legally guaranteed Lenin hegemony by admitting *five* Russian Party representatives to the Comintern Executive Committee with decisive vote as against only *one* for each large Communist Party and *none* for small parties and groups *(Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International,* 6). Zinoviev acted as a permanent chairman of the Executive Committee. The power of the Executive Committee was widened as provided in point 9: "The Executive Committee makes the necessary appeals on behalf of the Communist International, and issues instructions obligatory on all the parties and organizations which form part of the Communist International. The Executive Committee of the Communist International enjoys the right to demand from the affiliated parties the exclusion of groups of members who are guilty of the infringement of international proletarian discipline, as well as the exclusion from the Communist International of parties guilty of the infringement of the regulations of the World Congress. In the event of necessity the Executive Committee organizes in various countries its technical and auxiliary bureaus, which are entirely under the control of the Executive Committee." (6-7)

Thus, instead of a democratic world party with equal rights for all sections, the Comintern at the outset was a *burocratic* national tool of the Russian Oligarchs.

About a year-and-half earlier, on March 19, 1919, when the Comintern had but just been constituted, Lenin criticised the babblers among the leading members of the Bolshevik Party who spoke "of subordinating all the national parties to the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party." *(S. W.* VIII, 358). However, a month later Lenin indicated that this proposal was actually being carried out. "For a time—it goes without saying that it is only for a short time—hegemony in the revolutionary, proletarian International has passed to the Russians." *(S. W.* X, 34). The hegemony of the Kremlin burocracy in the Comintern was established not for a time but permanently.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Taking everything for granted, everything on the say-so of Lenin and Trotsky and of the burocratic leaders of the foreign sections, the revolutionary workers believed that the Comintern was just what its leadership said it was. But the bourgeoisie knew better. One of the Russian bourgeois spokesman, Potekhin, declared: "The Third International is becoming a powerful instrument in achieving the national aims of Russia." (Quoted by A. C. Izgoev, in *O Smene Vekh,* 9, 1922). Potekhin did not realize that this was the *sole* function of the Moscow International from its very inception. To shield Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev and other Bolshevik burocrats, a method of "confessions" was imposed on the lesser leaders in the Comintern. Thus, while it was Lenin who turned over the Finnish proletariat to the White Guard hangmen, the responsibility for his crime was assumed by Kuusinen—on Lenin's *suggestion!* "Kuusinen, one of the Finnish leaders, managed to escape to Russia from the terror. He eventually became one of the principal functionaries of the Comintern. Upon his arrival in Russia, he wrote an 'essay in self-criticism' upon Lenin's suggestion, in which he vigorously excoriated the conduct of himself and his fellow-leaders." *(Third Int. After Lenin,* "Expl. N." 322)

The "confession" absolved the counter-revolutionary gang in the Kremlin. The Russian and foreign Comintern burocrats made use of it whenever necessary. For illustration, Trotsky in reference to Kuusinen said, "he himself in 1918 did everything that lay in his modest resources to doom the revolution of the Finnish proletariat to destruction." (94). Thus Lenin's policy to "Let them have revolutionary Finland" was shrewdly screened by Lenin and Trotsky with Kuusinen's "confession."

6. *An Anti-Lenin Cry for a "Fourth International"*

Despite the pseudo-revolutionary noise of the Comintern, there were thousands of Communist workers who were deeply perturbed by the burocratic methods of the Lenin administration and by his Russian hegemony in the Comintern. Growing defiant of the authority of the Kremlin and determined to exercise their own will, these workers and many leading cadres conceived the idea of forming a new world-wide organization. The movement took the form of a rebellion against the dictatorship of the local leaders. In October 1919 a group of "Lefts" broke with the Communist Party of Germany, and on April 4, 1920 the rebels formed the Communist Labor Party (Die Communistische Arbeiter-Partei Deutschland—K.A.P.D.) which at the peak of its strength numbered 36,000 members. However, Lenin and Trotsky were but little alarmed. They were fully conscious of the fact that the movement did not possess one iota of theoretical understanding of the nature of the Russian leadership. Recalling the futile oppositional revolt against him in the Bolshevik Party, Lenin with a touch of contempt wrote in his Rightist pamphlet: "At the Ninth

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Congress of our Party (April 1920) there was a small opposition, which also spoke against the 'dictatorship of leaders' against the 'oligarchy,' and so on. Therefore, there is nothing surprising, nothing new, nothing terrible in the 'infantile disorder' of 'Left-wing Communism' among the Germans." (*S. W.* X, 84-5)

Under the slogan Down with the leaders! new leaders arose in this movement as was to be expected. It leaned strongly to the Left but the postulates it advanced were tremendous Rightist loopholes. The failure to evaluate the nature of Bolshevism kept the "Fourth Internationalists" within the orbit of the Comintern. At the Second Congress of the Moscow International (July-August 1920) the K.A.P.D. was officially accepted into the Comintern as a "sympathizing" party and was represented by two delegates. Next year the K.A.P.D. sent a delegation to the Third Congress (June-July 1921). But at this point Lenin and Trotsky decided to end the indefinite situation and presented the K.A.P.D. with an ultimatum to unite with the official Communist Party of Germany. This demand was flatly refused and the organizational separation of the K.A.P.D. from the Comintern became final.

Following the Third Congress the leadership of the K.A.P.D. asserted: "The Third International is working for the construction of the Russian state: the Second International for the reconstruction of the several capitalist states—that is the line of demarcation between the two. The Third International is lost for the proletarian revolution . . . Betrayal is all that can be expected from it. Hence, the absolute necessity of founding a new Communist Labour International." (Cited in *Labour Monthly,* Oct. 1921, 378)

In their attempt to form a Fourth International, the leaders of the K.A.P.D. and of other groups within the proletarian masses made an effort to reach the Workers Opposition in Russia. The August 9, 1921 decision of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party condemning the conduct of Shliapnikov and others, stated: "This conduct of the members of the former 'Workers Opposition' led to a point where the groups striving to create a Fourth International addressed themselves to the members of the former 'Workers Opposition' as kindred spirits with support and appeals for unity with them. They reprinted and widely circulated such works as the brochure 'On the Workers Opposition' by Comrade Kollontai. The comrades of the former 'Workers Opposition' did not decisively rebuff them, did not differentiate themselves publicly and officially from these groups which are injurious to the workers movement, but merely confined themselves on this score to weak statements." ("Documents and Materials," Lenin, XXVII, R. 485)

In 1922 the leaders of the movement, Gorter and Pannekoek, made a futile attempt to launch a "Fourth International." A year later the movement had disintegrated and was but a memory.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

7. *The Functions of the Comintern Under Lenin and Under Stalin*

In the hands of Lenin the Comintern performed a number of very vital tasks for his system of power. Primarily he used the organization to prevent the emancipation of the international proletariat and the colonial slaves from imperialist oppression. In connection with this work Lenin utilized the Comintern to bring pressure to bear on the imperialists for the cessation of the intervention. Another task of the Comintern was to justify before the workers the diplomatic and commercial deals the Bolshevik burocrats concluded or negotiated with imperialist powers.

During the Stalinist period the Comintern, in addition to all the functions mentioned above, acted as an extention of Stalin's political police to carry out abductions and assassinations of Trotskyites, Anarchists, Social Democrats, POUMists, as well as deserters from the Russian burocracy. Wherever supported, directly or indirectly, by Stalin's armed forces, the Comintern took over the management of various puppet countries and territories on the periphery of the Russian State. Lastly, the Comintern acted as an auxiliary to Stalin's Russian war machine.

CHAPTER XXIII.

STALIN IN POWER AND LENIN'S FUTILE AWAKENING

1. *A Vast Burocratic Blunder*

FOR FIVE eventful years, from the day Stalin was included in the Sovnarkom, Lenin kept broadening the man's administrative power. Evidence can be adduced to demonstrate further Lenin's deep concern for Stalin's personal well-being, an abundant indication of Lenin's real affection for this brutal and crafty henchman. Here is a telegram sent by Lenin to one of Stalin's cronies: "Ordjonikidze. July 17, 1921. 1:30 p.m. First, please inform me of Stalin's health and the conclusion of the doctors about it." *(Len. Sb.* XX, 74)

Trotsky, who knew of Lenin's real feelings for Stalin but who endeavored to create an opposite impression, nevertheless left documentary proof in the form of testimony of Stalin's physician, Rosanov. In December 1920 Stalin underwent an operation. Lenin, says Dr. Rozanov—"Called me by telephone every day, twice a day, morning and evening, and not merely inquired about his health but insisted upon the most thoroughgoing and extensive report. Comrade Stalin's operation was a very difficult one. A wide incision had to be made around the appendix at the time of the appendectomy, and we found it hard to guarantee results. It was obvious that Vladimir Ilyitch was worried. 'If anything should happen,' he said to me, 'telephone at

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

once—any time, night or day.' When on the fourth or fifth day after the operation it became clear that there was no longer any danger and I told him about it, he exclaimed straight from his heart, 'Thank you ever so much!' " (Quoted in *Stalin,* 354)

Acting upon the assumption that he was cultivating a bosom friend, not a Frankenstein's monster, Lenin did everything in his power to restore Stalin to health and a long life. This is the sense of Dr. Rosanov's record: "Once while calling at Comrade Stalin's apartment, I happened to run into Vladimir Ilyich there. He greeted me cordially, took me aside and again plied me with innumerable questions about Comrade Stalin's illness and cure. I said that it was necessary to send him away for a rest, so that he might properly recuperate from the difficult operation. He chimed in: 'That's just what I told him! But he won't listen to me! However, I'll take care of that. But not in one of the sanatoriums. I am told they are good now, but I haven't seen anything good about them yet.' I suggested: 'Why doesn't he go straight into his native hills?' To which Vladimit Ilyich replied: 'You are right! There he'll be further away from everything and no one will bother him. We'll have to see to that.' " *(Ib.).* Trotsky left no comment on Dr. Rosanov's testimony. It was in Trotsky's portfolio after he had been struck down by the assassin.

At the Eleventh Congress of the R.C.P., (March 27-April 2, 1922) where Stalin was inducted as General Secretary, an attempt was made to deprive Stalin of some of his vast powers. Preobrajensky said: "Let us take, for example, Comrade Stalin a member of the Politburo, who is at the same time a People's Commissar of two Commissariats. Is it conceivable that a man can be in a position to be responsible for the work of two Commissariats and besides for work of the Politburo, the Orgburo, and a dozen Commissions of the Central Committee?" Lenin thwarted the transparent goal of Preobrajensky and others: "Now Preobrajensky here carelessly talked about Stalin being in two Commissariats. Well, who among us is not a sinner, who has not taken several responsibilities at once? How otherwise can things be done? What can we do now in order to assure the existing situation in the Commissariat of Nationalities, to solve all the Turkestan, Caucasian and other problem? And these are all political problems! And it is imperative that they be solved—these are problems which for hundreds of years occupied the European States and which to an infinitesimal degree have been solved in democratic republics. We are solving them, and we require a man whom any representatives of nationalities could approach and tell in detail what the matter is. Where can such a man be found? I think that even Preobrajensky could not name any other candidate than Comrade Stalin. The same concerning Rabkrin. The task is gigantic. But in order to be able to handle the inspection it is necessary that at its head stands a man of authority, otherwise we shall get stuck in the mire, we shall drown in petty intrigues." *(St. R.* 127)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Still, Trotsky says that Lenin opposed Stalin's candidacy for the post of General Secretary: "Under Lenin the post of general secretary, established by the tenth congress, could have only a technical character, never political. Yet Lenin was apprehensive. 'This cook will make only peppery dishes.'" *(My Life,* II, 202) If Lenin were really uneasy about Stalin's excessive power, why did he put himself officially on record as a defender of Stalin in all the high posts the man held in March 1922? Is it not rather likely that Trotsky distorted the meaning of Lenin's remark? The whole logic of the internal Party situation in 1921-1922 gives that remark a totally opposite meaning. In Lenin's mind the "peppery dishes" were to be served not to him and the Central Commitee but to *the Workers Opposition,* to the *Kronstadt rebels, and* to all the *embittered proletarian die-hards* who could not stomach Lenin's corrupting policies.

For many months after the Eleventh Congress Lenin continued to stand loyally by his favorite. On April 18, 1922 Trotsky ventured to criticize the Rabkrin and thus attempted to hit Stalin. In a secret letter to Lenin, Trotsky stated: "It is impossible to shut one's eyes to the fact that the Rabkrin is filled chiefly with persons who had failed in various other spheres. Hence incidentally the extraordinary development of intrigue in the Rabkrin, which has long ago become a by-word throughout the country. There is no reason to assume that this institution (not its small ruling circles only, but the entire organization) can be restored to health and strengthened, because in the future the efficient workers will continue to be assigned to the actual job itself, not to its inspection. Hence, the fantastic nature of the plan to improve the machinery of the Soviet State through the leverage of the Rabkrin is obvious." *(Stalin,* 346-7; Lenin, XXVII, R. 542). Without much delay Lenin hit back in defense of Stalin: "Comrade Trotsky is radically wrong about the Rabkrin." *(Stalin,* 347; Lenin, XXVII, R. 289)

Autumn of 1922 came and with it the internal tumult in the Georgian Bolshevik leadership. The editor of *Stalin* makes a reference to Lenin's *original* position in the clash between the Stalin and the Mdivani faction: "As late as October 21, 1922, Lenin rebuffed the highly indignant protest of the Georgian opposition against Stalin and Ordjonikidze with a scathing telegram." *(Stalin,* 357). This highly important telegram which forms an integral part of the Georgian case is not cited in *Stalin.* Indeed, Trotsky, who appears to have captured the prime pieces of the scandal, presented only those which were directed *against* Stalin. In the Stalin camp, naturally, the anti-Stalin evidence which Trotsky adduces is concealed, but Lenin's barbed telegram attacking Stalin's opponents in Georgia is published, as follows: "I am astonished at the unseemly tone of the wire signed by Tsintsadze and others, delivered to me by Comrade Bukharin and not by one of the secretaries of the C.C. I was convinced that the disagreements had been settled by the decision of the Plenum of the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

C.C. with my indirect participation, and with the direct participation of Mdivani. I therefore emphatically condemn your vituperation against Ordjonikidze, and insist that you submit your conflict in a decent and loyal tone for settlement by the Secretariat of the C.C., to which I am writing your message. Lenin." (Quoted by L. Beria in *On the History of the Bolshevik Organizations in Transcaucasia,* 179)

In this instance Lenin was playing a cruel joke on Mdivani and the other anti-Stalin Georgians by telling them to submit their case against Stalin's hatchetman, Ordjonikidze, to the Secretariat which was controlled by Stalin!

As far as this investigator could gather, Lenin's efforts to safeguard Stalin's authority did not extend beyond October 1922. By the irony of history, in the formative years of the Bolshevik State, Lenin committed a fatal burocratic error. He had been under the delusory impression that he had cultivated an assistant of unquestionable personal loyalty; instead, he created an "heir-apparent."

2. *Lenin Seeks Support Against his Successor*

Living for five years in a fool's paradise regarding Stalin, Lenin required a shock to make him see that though the threat from the Russian workers and peasants, from the international proletariat and from imperialism had tangibly receded, a totally unforseen danger now threatened him from what had seemed to be a safe quarter.

His first stroke of paralysis occurred on May 26, 1922. For several months Lenin was compelled to stay away from the administrative center and to refrain from activity. Slowly his faculties returned and by September he engaged in correspondence with the high Party officials. It was at this juncture that Stalin, as a rule extremely wary with Lenin, let his guard slip and committed an indiscretion. Lenin inoffensively counseled caution regarding the moves in unification of the various outlying territories with Moscow: "Stalin is somewhat inclined to hurry." Stalin replied arrogantly. He repeated Lenin's expression, thereby mockingly indicating he resented his Master's remark: "Comrade Lenin himself 'hurried' a little." (Quoted by Trotsky in *Stalin School* 66-67). Stalin's behavior, new to Lenin, called for serious reflection.

In Moscow on October 2, 1922, Lenin began to pay close attention to the mechanics of Stalin's power: "In October he returns to the Kremlin and officially takes up his work. 'There is no evil without good,' he writes privately in the draft of a future speech. 'I have been sitting quiet for a half year and looking on from the sidelines.' Lenin means to say: I formerly sat too steadily at my post and failed to observe many things; the long interruption has now permitted me to see much with fresh eyes." *(Sup. Test.* 22-23)

Beyond question, for a few weeks Lenin was somewhat confused, and that accounts for his sharp telegram to the Mdivani faction. But the situation had greatly changed since the Spring of 1922, and Lenin

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

realized that his power was now nearly nominal. For a usurper this was truly a bitter dish. Plainly, it was only when Lenin realized he was no longer the real wire-pulling head of the Party that he came out against Stalin.

Lenin's mind took a definite shape on the Stalin issue in December 1922; the first and only known written expression of Lenin's new policy to destroy Stalin appeared in the postscript to the Testament signed January 4, 1923.

We must now go back a moment to the Georgian case to determine the intrinsic meaning of Lenin's anti-Stalin documents—the notes to Mdivani, to Trotsky, and the letter on the national question which was addressed to the Twelfth Congress (April 1923) and which was discussed and suppressed by the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev clique and their then ally, Trotsky, in the Presidium of that Congress.

Lenin accused Stalin of Great-Russian nationalism. Coming from a man whose policy before and since Brest was permeated with Great Russian nationalism, at certain moments glaringly vivid as demonstrated by his belligerent stand on the issue of permitting a handful of German soldiers to Moscow and his line in the matter of the Dardanelles, that accusation against Stalin lacked sincerity.

Regarding the political nature of the Mdivani-Makharadze leaders, Stalin had a good case in proving that they were not Russian "internationalists" but confirmed Georgian nationalists. It will be sufficient to cite their decree of March 31, 1922 on citizenship to show that in certain features of nationalist policy they were more openly reactionary than Stalin: "Georgian citizenship shall be lost: by any Georgian female citizen who shall marry a foreigner." (From a telegram by Makharadze and Okudava, *S. R.* of the Twelfth Congress, 161)

Lenin required a "case" against Stalin and he also needed factional allies. Certain changes had occurred in the line-up of the leading figures of the Central Committee. Most of them, he clearly observed, had during his illness grouped themselves around the General Secretary. Lenin thought Trotsky the logical choice as an ally against Stalin; still he had his fears that Trotsky might recoil from the perspective of evoking a new anti-Trotsky campaign. As late as March 5, 1923 Lenin manifested his uncertainty about Trotsky's attitude as recorded in the note asking Trotsky to defend the Georgian case.

The only other force that Lenin could utilize in moving against the ingrate henchman was the Mdivani-Makharadze Georgians, whom he planned to use as material witnesses against Stalin's Great-Russian nationalism which was to serve as a mover issue.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a/5.0
.CCEPT-

3. *Equivocal Features of the Testament*

Lenin could not have come forward even before his closest associates and frankly admit the dangerous result of having raised a mediocre Party leader to the uppermost heights of power. The desire to remove Stalin could not be presented as his own personal matter. It was convenient to treat the organizational question on the basis of relations between Stalin and *Trotsky* and the supposed danger of a split in the Party. However, in this period, as Trotsky himself is impelled to show, relations between him and Stalin were of a most cordial character as compared with the deep mutual hostility dividing them in 1918-1921. The utmost confidence which Stalin placed in Trotsky was demonstrated, as Trotsky implies, in the secret consultation on hoodwinking Lenin very shortly after Lenin had dictated the Testament, by sending Trotsky to the Seventh All-Ukrainian Bolshevik Party Congress where one of Stalin's leading henchmen called for unity of all Bolshevik forces around Stalin and Trotsky. As for Trotsky, his refusal to agree to Ordjonikidze's expulsion, his opposition to the removal of Stalin, and his policy at the Twelfth Congress show that his thoughts ran along the line of Trotsky-Stalin unity. From every aspect it is abundantly clear that Lenin's statement in the Testament about the necessity of removing Stalin as a guarantee against a split in the Party along Stalin-Trotsky lines was intended to *create* a split between Stalin and Trotsky at the Twelfth Congress. It was part of the plan to force Trotsky, of whose stand Lenin was somewhat in doubt, to line up solidly with him against Stalin.

Lenin's hesitation in committing to writing his decision to remove Stalin can be gathered from the fact that the Testament was written in two parts: the body dictated on December 25, 1922, and the postscript on January 4, 1923. Although Lenin intended to arouse the Congress by alarming it with the peril of a split between Trotsky and Stalin, he failed to include directives in the body of the Testament whereby the Congress could prevent the split. On December 30 he dictated the letter on the national question asking the forthcoming Congress to take Stalin to task for the line in Georgia. Still, no definite instruction could be found regarding Lenin's *organizational* intentions on the Stalin issue. At length, on the 4 of January 1923 Lenin cast all hesitation aside and in the postscript plainly asked the Congress to oust Stalin—"from the point of view of the relations between Stalin and Trotsky which I discussed above." Working for Stalin's undoing, Lenin presented the "danger" of a split between Trotsky and Stalin to cover up the true issue, the actual and irrevocable split developing between himself and his old favorite.

Notably plain becomes the hidden meaning of the implied charge in the Testament that Stalin was not sufficiently loyal supposedly to the proletariat. Since both Stalin and Lenin were consciously disloyal to the proletariat, the moralizing note referred not

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

to Stalin's attitude toward the masses but to the relation between Stalin and his *specific* superior. Lenin could and did wink at Stalin's intrigues against Trotsky and Stalin's arrogant defiance of official orders during the Tsaritsin period and in the Polish War. But Lenin showed no indulgence when Stalin turned about and manifested disdain towards him.

Stalin's rudeness, one of the reasons offered by Lenin for the need to remove him from the post of General Secretary, is a preposterous and transparently clumsy pretext. The trait of Stalin's was no recent discovery. When Lenin stood on surer grounds of power he had highly valued Stalin's rudeness as part of the man's "ability to exert pressure." Lenin's own methods were replete with rudeness, and in his rhetorical bouts with Bukharin, Trotsky Osinsky, Kollontai, Riazanov, Radek and others he was frequently curt, abrupt, overbearing and abusive. There was a reason why in the Testament Lenin defended rudeness as "entirely supportable in relations among us Communists." He could not erase from the mind of the leading figures in the Party his own uncomradely behavior and the fact that for many years he had stubbornly disregarded all protests against Stalin's intrigues, yielded to Stalin's wishes and caprices and systematically condoned Stalin's offenses, malice and brutal attitude toward subordinates. Reference to Lenin's own brutal, arrogant and abusive attitude toward others is found in a Bolshevik publication. The author pretends to accept this attitude as paternal: "Lenin was at times strongly abusive, but his words would not leave a bad feeling in one's soul. There was always only an unpleasant realization that he was abusing you for a reason. In my life he was the only man from whom I took the sharpest rebukes without a pain. The attitude towards him was as though towards a father. You certainly wouldn't be angry with your father if he abused you for a reason. And such attitude was everybody's. Very many people were scolded harshly by him, but they recalled it with the most good-natured snicker, as of a most pleasant memory." (N. Meshcheriakov, "From Reminiscences about Lenin." *Pechat i Revolutsia,* 1924, II, 13-14)

The clumsiness and shamness of Lenin's pretext in the Testament can be seen from another aspect. If rudeness were a supportable characteristic of relations among "Communists" then the post of General Secretary logically *belonged* to Stalin. In that capacity Stalin dealt only with Party members. Had Lenin omitted the issue of that key post and discussed the People's Commissariat for Nationalities and Rabkrin, his argument could have carried some logic. In those offices, Stalin often received various non-Party people from all the sectors of the Bolshevik State. But personal motive would have been startlingly evident if Lenin had attempted to remove Stalin from these Commissariats because only very recently he had peremptorily declared that no better man could be found to head those two Commissariats than *Stalin!*

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a/5.0
.CCEPT-

Lenin resolved to replace the pivotal figure of the apparatus with an obliging office-boy of unquestionable fidelity to him. A new man filling the post of General Secretary would have been no boss surrounded with a huge army of officials in a dozen departments of the State all owing allegiance directly or indirectly to him. The privilege of appointment and removal would have been his, of course. But it would have taken him, as it had Stalin, many years to build up a personal machine; and for one starting from scratch the task would have been insurmountable. Lenin would have established a check-rein on such a key figure as General Secretary.

As for Stalin, he would no longer have held an important place in the Party. Lenin naturally would have to break up Stalin's machine, using Trotsky as the organizational sledge-hammer. It was with this in mind that, as Trotsky says in *My Life,* Lenin promised Trotsky the post of chairman of People's Commissars. This last point was officially confirmed by Zinoviev during the first anti-Trotsky campaign: "When Lenin fell ill, Lenin himself proposed, with the support of the C.C., that Trotsky should be chosen as his deputy, as Chairman of People's Commissaries." *(Inprecor,* March 14, 1924, 175)

Trotsky was undecided. He could not let pass the recent lesson when Lenin had frustrated his burocratic scheme. Which side could offer Trotsky the best deal? Neither side could be trusted. Lenin had condoned the demagogic and terroristic activity against the Trotsky faction during the Trade Union Discussion and the whispering campaign against Trotsky's former non-Bolshevism. Lenin had mercilessly ousted Trotsky's supporters, Krestinsky and others, from power. Would it not be wiser, in view of Lenin's illness and the actual power in Stalin's hands, to keep peace with Stalin? Moreover, Trotsky was not at all sure that Lenin would get well enough to fight.

The course of the lives of the foremost figures of the Bolshevik State would have been vastly different had Trotsky exploded Lenin's "bomb" at the Twelfth Congress. Without question Stalin would have been "liquidated." Because Trotsky cast his lot with the Trio, he rendered futile Lenin's belated awakening. Stalin remained in the Kremlin to carry on the same sinister Russian-burocratic policies in the internal and international affairs as under Lenin, while Lenin's embalmed remains were deposited in a mausoleum outside the Kremlin walls.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XXIV.

TROTSKY'S HINT AT ASSASSINATION OF LENIN

1. *Trotsky Reports a Strange Conversation*

In August 1940 Trotsky published an astounding article under the sensational title: "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" In it Trotsky told a fantastic-sounding story:

"I followed the course of Lenin's second illness day by day through the physician we had in common, Dr. Gaitier.

" 'Is it possible, Fedor Alexandrovich, that this is the end?' my wife and I would ask him time and again.

" 'That cannot be said at all. Vladimir Ilyich can get on his feet again. He has a powerful organism.'

" 'And his mental faculties?'

" 'Basically, they will remain untouched. Not every note, perhaps, will keep its former purity, but the virtuoso will remain a virtuoso.'

"Yet at a meeting of the Politburo members, Zinoviev, Kamenev, and myself, Stalin informed us, after the departure of the secretary, that Lenin had suddenly called him in and had asked him for poison. Lenin was again losing the faculty of speech, considered his situation hopeless, foresaw the approach of a new stroke, did not trust his physicians. His mind was perfectly clear and he suffered unendurably.

"I recall how extraordinary, enigmatic, and out of tune with the circumstances Stalin's face seemed to me then. A sickly smile was fixed on it, as on a mask. I see before me the pale and silent Kamenev, who sincerely loved Lenin, and Zinoviev, bewildered, as at all difficult moments. Had they known about Lenin's request? Or had Stalin sprung this as a surprise on his allies in the triumvirate as well as on me?

" 'Naturally, we cannot even consider carrying out this request!' I exclaimed. 'Gaitier has not lost hope. Lenin can still recover.'

" 'I told him all that,' Stalin replied, not without a touch of annoyance. 'But he wouldn't listen to reason. The old man is suffering. He says he wants to have the poison at hand. He'll use it when he is convinced that his condition is hopeless.' 'Anyway, it's out of the question,' I insisted. 'He might succumb to a passing mood and take the irrevocable step.'

" 'The old man is suffering,' Stalin repeated, staring vaguely past us. No vote was taken, since this was not a formal conference, but we parted with the implicit understanding that we could not even consider sending poison to Lenin." *(Liberty,* August 10, 1940, 24)

The conspiratorial nature of the "poison consultation" as described by Trotsky, is obvious. It was made public by Trotsky, by him alone, more than seventeen years after February 1923, the date when the alleged discussion had taken place. How did Trotsky evaluate Stalin's "proposal" at the time?

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

fozilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

It was only a few days before Lenin broke all comradely relations with Stalin (March 6, 1923). Trotsky, however, knew of the extreme tension and animosity which had been developing between Lenin and Stalin for many months. In the Autumn of 1922 he had discussed with Lenin the question of the formation of a bloc against Stalin and in January 1923 he had witnessed an attempt on the part of the Stalin ring to hoodwink Lenin by printing only one copy of *Pravda* with Lenin's article.

Years later Trotsky enumerated Lenin's sharpest moves against Stalin which had preceded the alleged "poison" discussion:

"Thus it would be no exaggeration to say that the last half year of Lenin's political life, between his convalescence and his second illness, was filled with a sharpening struggle against Stalin. Let us recall once more the principal dates. In September Lenin opened fire against the national policy of Stalin. In the first half of December he attacked Stalin on the question of the monopoly of foreign trade. . . . On December 30, 1922, he wrote his letter on the national question (the 'bomb'). On January 4 he added a postscript to his testament on the necessity of removing Stalin from his position as general secretary." *(Sup. Test.* 29)

Stalin knew that Lenin's iron constitution was capable of rallying for energetic action, as had been witnessed in the past. It would have been fatal for the General Secretary to permit Lenin's appearance at the Twelfth Congress. Trotsky does not indicate the exact date on which Stalin first learned of the contents of the Testament, but as to whether Stalin read the document before Lenin's death, Trotsky's testimony is very definite:

"When Stalin first read the text he broke out into billingsgate against Lenin. The testament not only failed to terminate the internal struggle, which was what Lenin wanted, but enhanced it to a feverish pitch. Stalin could no longer doubt that Lenin's return to activity would mean his own political death. *Only Lenin's death* could clear the way for him." *(Liberty,* August 10, 1940. Our emph.—G. S.)

It must have been obvious to Trotsky, as to Stalin, that in view of the seriousness of the rift, the only possible alternatives were: elimination of Lenin or elimination of Stalin. Stalin could and would have been eliminated organizationally had Lenin returned to political work; Lenin could be eliminated only through death. As the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" clearly indicates, Trotsky at the reported secret meeting did not *openly* voice any doubt that Lenin had called in Stalin and asked for poison. However, he shows that *inwardly* he was far from believing Stalin: "But did Lenin actually ask Stalin for poison? Was the whole version not invented by Stalin to prepare his alibi?"

Why didn't Trotsky verify Stalin's story on such a vital issue? In the *Liberty* article Trotsky asserts that Stalin "could have had no reason to fear a verification for no one could question the sick Lenin."

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

As a matter of plain logic at the end of February 1923 Stalin could have had every reason to fear a verification of his story. First, if Lenin had called anyone in, he must have done so either through his wife or his two secretaries. Early in March 1923, as we recall, Trotsky was in communication with Lenin through these secretaries. It would have been very simple for Trotsky to inquire into the nature of Stalin's visit, or at least to find out if such a visit had actually taken place.

If Stalin's fantastic story could have been so easily checked, why did he speak so recklessly in Trotsky's presence? Evidently Stalin at the end of February 1923 knew precisely to what extent he could trust Trotsky. Be it remembered that a few days later, on March 6, Trotsky assured Kamenev with a very definite statement: "I am against liquidating Stalin."

2. *Discrepancies in Trotsky's Testimony on Lenin's Health*

That Lenin broke down in March 1923, about a month before the Twelfth Congress, was fairly well known. But hardly a person in the world, save the ring of the conspirators and the people attending upon Lenin, was aware of the immensely significant fact that toward the end of 1923 and in the beginning of 1924 during the discussion of "Trotskyism" Lenin's health showed a marked improvement. Trotsky knew that. Eager to create the false impression that he never swerved from Lenin's path and that Lenin was cognizant of this, Trotsky in his autobiography reproduced a letter received from Lenin's wife, Krupskaya, in which she indicated that Lenin to his dying day reposed unshaken confidence in Trotsky. Inadvertently, however, by citing this letter Trotsky allowed the information to escape that not long before the end Lenin was not on the verge of death:

" 'Dear Lev Davidovich, I write to tell you that about a month before his death, as he was perusing your book, Vladimir Ilyich stopped at the place where you characterize Marx and Lenin, and asked me to read it to him. He listened attentively, then looked it over again himself.' " (II, 251)

For sixteen and a half years Trotsky avoided stating that Lenin was recovering in the Winter of 1923-1924. At every mention of Lenin's last illness he lent an opposite impression. In 1926, Trotsky, still a member of Stalin's Central Committee, wrote an article on Lenin for the *Encyclopedia Britannica.* Reference to Lenin's condition from March 1923 to January 21, 1924, the day of his death, is completely omitted: "At the beginning of 1922 his doctors forbade him his daily work. From June to August the disease made rapid progress, and for the first time he began to lose the power of speech and in December he became paralyzed in the right arm and leg. He died on January 21, 1924, at 6:30 p.m. at Gorky, near Moscow." Equally misleading was Trotsky's remark about Lenin recorded in *The Case of Leon Trotsky* published in 1937: "But he became sick again and definitely—it was

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the 5th or 6th of March, 1923. This time his illness lasted until his death." (77)

But in the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" Trotsky suddenly "remembered" about Lenin's recovery in the Winter of 1923-1924: "Lenin asked for poison—if he really did—at the end of February 1923. In the beginning of March (1923) he was again paralyzed. But his powerful organism, supported by his inflexible will, reasserted itself. Toward winter he began to improve slowly, to move about more freely; he listened to reading and read himself; his faculty of speech began to come back to him. The findings of the physicians became increasingly more hopeful." That certainly does not look like "This time his illness lasted until his death."

In most of their narratives about Lenin the Stalin historians pursue a certain fogginess when they reach the period of 1923-24. But in some writings they revealed that he was convalescing. Ralph Fox records Lenin's visit to Moscow in October 1923: "As the summer wore on it looked as though he were winning. His speech came back, his paralysis grew better. On October 19th he passed a few hours in Moscow. In January 1924 his eyes began to trouble him, but to the oculist he seemed well and full of courage." *(Lenin, a Biography,* 313)

The later official Stalin texts agree with Fox's account of Lenin's condition for 1923:

"Second half of July. The health of Vladimir Ilyich begins to improve. Gradually the faculty of speech returns and the ability to move about independently.

"October 10. Vladimir Ilyich arrives in Moscow and visits his work-room. On his way back to Gorki, stops at the country fair." ("Basic mileposts of V. I. Lenin's life," Lenin, *Works,* 1936. XXVII, R. 602)

"In January and February 1923 the condition of Vladimir Ilyich's health was notably vacillating toward worsening . . . In September Vladimir Ilyich already could without aid from others walk down and up the stairs, and in October he, on his own strength, paced the room . . . Speech was gradually improving; Vladimir Ilyich was daily looking over the newspaper, and was pointing out the articles to be read to him, manifesting thereby live interest in their content and clearly assimilating it . . . With the arrival of sunny winter days Vladimir Ilyich not infrequently took sleigh rides into the forest accompanied by hunters. During these excursions he was animated and merry." *(Umer Lenin,* Moscow, 1924, 46-7)

Krupskaya recorded Lenin's refusal to accept the offices of a nurse: "'Everything goes well with us. He went hunting. Wouldn't take me along—said he wanted no nurse. Studies (reading) go well. He is in good mood, cracks jokes and laughs uproariously.'" (Cited in *Prolet. Revolutsia,* 3 (26), 1924, 18)

Oppressed by unendurable apprehension, every one of the participants in the Stalin conspiracy was bound to take account of the threat

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lenin's recovery held for each of them. Their terror must have been rising daily with the reports of the physicians on Lenin's improving condition.

Publicly, during the ten months while he was definitely improving, the Bolshevik leadership did not issue a report regarding the actual condition of Lenin's health. This alone is a very mysterious feature.

3. *Mystery Surrounding Lenin's Death*

In the article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" Trotsky says the physicians did not expect Lenin's death and were unable to explain its immediate cause. If Lenin was poisoned, as Trotsky leads one to conclude, that could have been established with ease by the surgeons who performed the autopsy. More significant, Trotsky says that Stalin himself supervised the autopsy! "When I asked the physicians in Moscow about the immediate cause of Lenin's death, which they had not expected, they were at a loss to account for it. The autopsy was carried out with all the necessary rites: Stalin took care of this himself. But the surgeons did not search for poison. They understood that politics stand above medicine."

What is the hint permeating Trotsky's phrases "But the surgeons did not search for poison. They understood that politics stand above medicine"? Did Trotsky ask them if they searched for poison? In this article Trotsky speaks in enigmas but he keys up the story to the only possible answer to the question he raises in the title.

In his *Liberty* article Trotsky states that Zinoviev and Kamenev avoided all discussion about Lenin's death, while Bukharin made "strange allusions": "I did not renew personal relations with Zinoviev and Kamenev until two years later, after they had broken with Stalin. They avoided all discussions of Lenin's death. Only Bukharin made now and then, tete-a-tete, unexpected and strange allusions. 'Oh, you don't know Koba (Stalin),' he said with his frightened smile. 'Koba is capable of anything.' "

If Trotsky's account in "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" is somewhat vague, in his work *Stalin* the narrative dealing with the poison topic is almost transparently clear. (381)

Trotsky was evidently determined to have it understood, without saying so outright, that Lenin was assassinated. He mentions the fate of those elected to the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party at its April 1917 Conference. Trotsky was not yet a member of the Bolshevik Party. The most eminent figure elected to the Central Committee in April 1917 was, of course, Lenin. "Of the members of the Central Committee elected at the April Conference, only Sverdlov managed to die a natural death. *All* the others—with the exception of Stalin himself—as well as the four alternates, have either been officially shot or have been done away with unofficailly." (202-3. Our emph.—G. S.)

Lenin, naturally, was guarded against possible assassins from the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

camps of the White Guards and Social Revolutionists. But no one in Lenin's household suspected that an assassin's hand would reach out from the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party.

4. *Why Trotsky's Belated Revelations*

If Trotsky's article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" is even partly true, why did he conceal such facts for so many crucial years? Trotsky says that the original conspiratorial circle sharing the secrets connected with Lenin's death numbered only about *eight* people! "In 1922, the apprehensive Lenin had warned: 'That cook will prepare nothing but peppery dishes.' They proved to be not only peppery but poisoned, and not only figuratively but literally so. Two years ago I wrote down for the first time the facts which in their day (1923-1924) were known to no more than seven or eight persons, and then only in part. Of that number, besides myself, only Stalin and Molotov are still among the living." *(Stalin,* 372-3). If so, then not only the whole Party membership was excluded from knowing those facts but even the Stalinist burocracy! The narrow top circle can be easily identified: Stalin, Molotov, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukharin, Yagoda, and either Ordjonikidze or Dzerjinsky. By his own acknowledgment, Trotsky, the future "oppositionist," was included, which is a gauge of the confidence Stalin placed in him and an indication that Trotsky stood at the very center of Stalinist conspiracy against Lenin.

But why did Trotsky finally, in 1940, burst forth with a startling story about Lenin's death? The answer to the question can be arrived at after a brief reflection. The article "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" was, of course, no accident. The relentless hounding, monstrous frame-ups, assassination of close friends and members of his family, put Trotsky under terrific pressure. His method of retaliation was limited by his own part in the Stalinist development. He would reveal, occasionally and desultorily, only a few facts about Stalin's intrigues and crimes, invariably protecting himself in these revelations. Even during such shocking spectacles as the Moscow Trials Trotsky maintained a dead silence regarding the matter he subsequently dealt with in "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" and in *Stalin.* However, the probable poisoning of Trotsky's son by Stalin's agents in Paris and the direct attempt to assassinate him and his wife in Mexico on May 24, 1940 obviously brought his hatred for Stalin to a white heat. And intense hatred for a double-crossing criminal leads many an accomplice to disclose details of a crime even to the point of self-exposure. In "Did Stalin Poison Lenin?" and in *Stalin* Trotsky almost reached this point. Needless to argue, had it not been for the fact that Stalin broke with Trotsky after the Twelfth Congress and used him as a scapegoat, Trotsky would never have let slip even the meagre information he did reveal about the development of the Stalin dictatorship, let alone the virtually open assertion that Stalin poisoned Lenin.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XXV.

TWO BASIC REACTIONARY TRAITS IN BOLSHEVISM

1. *Lenin's Ingrained Great-Russian Nationalism*

DID BOLSHEVISM become a Great-Russian nationalist, burocratic tendency only with the seizure of power in 1917? Far from it. In December 1914, several months after the outbreak of the imperialist war, Lenin published an article "On the National Pride of the Great-Russians." In it he posed a question and gave his answer as follows: "Are we enlightened Great-Russian proletarians impervious to the feeling of national pride? Certainly not! We love our language and our motherland." *(C. W.* XVIII, 100)

This is a language of a man whose entire being is saturated with Great Russian nationalism. It must be noted, however, that Lenin's Great-Russian nationalism was of a "proletatian" nature: "We are filled with national pride because of the knowledge that the Great-Russian nation, too, has created a revolutionary class." *(Ib.)* National pride reduces the masses of every "other" nation to a lower plane and carries with it the false sense of national superiority. "We, Great-Russian workers, filled with national pride, wish by all means to have a free and independent, sovereign, democratic, republican, proud Great-Russia, which is to maintain in relation to her neighbours the humane principle of equality, and not the serf principles of privileges that humiliate a great nation." (101)

Russian "proletarian patriotism" was the primary impulse behind Lenin's political activity from beginning to end, and such an outlook could never be brought into harmony with genuine world proletarian interests. His glorifiers and sychophants, following his example, attempted to blend on paper the two mutually exclusive traits. For instance, Zinoviev, in an article *Nikolai Lenin,* wrote: "Lenin was great both as a Russian and a world revolutionary. He was Russian from top to toe. He was the embodiment of Russia. He knew and felt Russia. Despite the many years of exile and life as an emigrant, this person breathed of Russia. While residing in Krakow, about six miles from the Russian border, Lenin frequently took a trip across the frontier to 'get a gulp of Russian air.' The very essence of his life was Russia, he felt Russia, he felt every blade of grass on the Russian road, he was Russian to the marrow of his bones." *(Comm. Int.* "Jubilee Number," 13). Commissar of Education, Lunacharsky, wrote: "He was a great builder of the type no less than Peter the Great. 'If only Russia lives!' moreover, Russia as the cornerstone of the world structure, Russia as the instrument for world victory." ("Lenin," *Pechat i Revolutsia,* 1924, I, 15)

Lenin did much public talking about his "revolutionary internationalist" feeling toward the Poles. Privately he was on Russian-nationalist grounds. His wife in a letter to Lenin's mother indicated how "Volodia," that is Lenin, felt: "Volodia somehow, as if by design,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

became a great reader of 'belle letters.' And he is a terrible nationalist. You can't get him to look at the paintings of Polish artists, but he picked up a catalog of the Tretiakov Gallery and has buried himself in it many times." (Dec. 26, 1913, *Letters to Relatives*, R. 396) The Tretiakov Gallery was of course a *Russian* institution.

One of the myths about Lenin is that during the war of 1914-18 he adopted a true world proletarian position. Investigation shows that Lenin's policy revolved around Russia. In October 1914 he made a distinct separation between the goal of the Russian Bolshevik leadership and that of the world proletariat: "Under given conditions, it is impossible to determine from the standpoint of the international proletariat which is the lesser evil for Socialism: the defeat of one or the defeat of the other group of belligerent nations. For us Russian Social-Democrats, however, there cannot exist the least doubt that from the standpoint of the working class and of the labouring masses of all the peoples of Russia, the lesser evil would be the defeat of the tsarist monarchy." (*C. W.* XVIII, 81). Lenin's position was an inverted Russian nationalism: "For us *Russians*, from the point of view of the interests of the laboring masses and the working class of *Russia*, there can not be the slightest doubt, absolutely no doubt whatever, that the *lesser* evil would be, here and now, the defeat of Tsarism in the present war. For Tsarism is a hundred times worse than Kaiserism." (Letter to Shliapnikov, Oct. 17, 1914. *Ib.* 74). Plainly, Lenin's position was that the military defeat of the Tsarist regime would weaken it and facilitate its overthrow and replacement by another purely Russian regime guided by the Bolsheviks. In March 1915 Lenin repeated his anti-Tsarist Russian nationalist slogan: "the defeat of Russia appears to be the lesser evil under all conditions." (150)

Viewing the task of the world proletariat through the distorting lense of Russian nationalism, and firmly adhering up to 1917 to the position of "democratic-dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" and therefore to the Russian bourgeois State, Lenin in essence stood in opposition to the line of struggle for the World Workers State. A few weeks before the October Revolution Lenin indicated that one of his chief aims was to save *Russia* from being partitioned by the big powers. "Having recognized the absolute necessity of an uprising of the workers of Petrograd and Moscow for the sake of saving the revolution and of saving Russia from being 'separately' divided among the imperialists of both coalitions, we must first adapt our political tactics at the conference to the conditions of the maturing uprising." (XXI, Pt. I, 227)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *Lenin's Inveterate Burocratism*

Impregnated with the virus of Russian national pride, Lenin many years before October manifested symptoms of the disease of burocratism. As early as 1904 Lenin openly championed the burocratic method, arguing that it was the organizational revolutionary principle of the proletarian movement:

"Bureaucracy *versus* democracy is the same thing as centralism *versus* autonomism, it is the organizational principle of revolutionary political democracy as opposed to the organizational principle of the opportunists of Social-Democracy. The latter want to proceed from the bottom upward and, consequently, wherever possible and to the extent that it is possible, it supports autonomism and 'democracy,' which may (by the over zealous) be carried as far as anarchism. The former proceed from the top, and advocate the extension of the rights and powers of the centre in respect of the parts." ("One Step Forward, Two Steps Back," *S. W.*, II, 447-8)

This informative passage is sufficiently plain to reveal that its author was transfused with the ideology of burocratic centralism. Trotsky incorrectly dates the emergence of the Bolshevik burocrat-revolutionist to the Third Party Congress (April-May 1905): "The negative aspect of Bolshevism's centripetal tendencies first became apparent at the Third Congress of the Russian Social-Democracy. The habits peculiar to a political machine were already forming in the underground. The young revolutionary burocrat was already emerging as a type." *(Stalin,* 61)

The Bolshevik burocracy presented the split between the Lenin majority and the Martov minority at the Second Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party (July 30 (17) 1903) as having been caused by profound political differences, especially on the duties and obligations of membership. This falsification penetrated not only the proletariat but also the bourgeois Liberal circles. The fact was that so minor were the differences that prior to the Congress "Nobody expected a split" (Krupskaya, *Memories of Lenin,* R. 96). And after the Congress Lenin in a private letter gave the real reason for the split: "I personally view the matter thus: the split was produced first of all and above all else by the dissatisfaction regarding the personal composition of the centers (the Central Organ and the Central Committee). The minority wanted to retain the old six in the C.O. But the Congress chose three out of the six, evidently considering them best suited for political leadership. Similarly the minority was defeated on the question of the composition of the C.C., i.e. the Congress did not elect those whom the minority wanted. On account of that the dissatisfied minority began to magnify petty differences, to boycott the Centers, pick up partisans and even to prepare a split of the Party." (Lenin to P. E. Vilonov, Dec. 22, 1903, *Len. Sb.* X, 84)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The original Bolshevik-Menshevik split was on personal *burocratic,* not on principled grounds. Politically the two tendencies were so close that both sets of burocrats soon called for reestablishing unity. After the fusion of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks was consummated at the Fourth, or Unity Congress (April 1906), Lenin submitted this analysis of the unification: "A big practical feature is the fusion of the Menshevik and Bolshevik fractions. The split is ended. The Social Democratic proletariat and its Party must be united. The organizational differences have been liquidated virtually in their entirety." *(C. W.* VII, 226).In a different article Lenin showed that the organizational differences had not been liquidated—and least of all on the question of appointments: "In the organizational question we differed only regarding the rights of the editorial staff of the Central Organ. We defended the right of the Central Committee to appoint and change the staff of the Central Organ." (176)

Lenin, as we see, was always a confirmed believer in the burocratic method of appointment, and all his noise in 1917, prior to October, about instituting proletarian democratic elections and recall from below was just so much demagogy to catch the workers.

Factionalism and the struggle for power in the united Party continued for many years. The closest that both leading factions ever got was in 1910. "The year 1910 was a year of joint work of the Bolsheviks with the Party Mensheviks in *all* the leading (both official and unofficial, legal and illegal) bodies of the Party; this was the first step of the 'alliance of the strong factions' toward ideological preparation, the gathering of the forces under a single banner, the anti-liquidationist and anti-otzovist banner." (Lenin, Dec. 1911, *S. W.* IV, 118)

Towards the end of 1911 the simmering factional struggles were brought to a head, with the Mensheviks led by Plekhanov breaking away from the Party. At the Prague Conference called by the Bolsheviks in January 1912 the Lenin wing assumed the role of *the Party.* Trotsky and many other groups denounced the Lenin move as a coup and formed what is known as the August Bloc against the Bolsheviks.

Along with burocratism Lenin advanced the method of political horse trade and high-handed extra-Party back-stage manipulation. Thus in 1912, during the Prague Conference, Lenin wanted to bring Stalin into the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party. Since the majority of the delegates rejected the candidacy of Koba, as Stalin was then called, Lenin resorted to a piece of gross burocratic trickery: "After preliminary negotiations with delegates, Lenin apparently deemed it wiser not to advance Koba's candidacy. 'When in 1912 Lenin brought Stalin into the Central Committee of the Party,' writes Dmitrievsky, 'it was met with indignation. Openly no one opposed it. But they gave vent to their indignation among themselves.' The information of the former diplomat, which as a rule does not merit

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

confidence, is nevertheless of interest in so far as it reflects burocratic recollections and gossip. Lenin undoubtedly met with serious opposition. There was but one thing he could do: wait until the conference came to an end and then appeal to the small leading circle, which either relied on Lenin's recommendation or shared his estimate of the candidate. Thus, Stalin for the first time came into the Central Committee through the back door." *(Stalin,* 137)

That the Bolshevik faction was anti-democratic from its very inception was confirmed by Zinoviev in 1924 when he was at the pinnacle of power as a member of Stalin's Trio:

"A general differentiation into the following periods may be made in the history of the Bolsheviki: 1st period until 1905. Expressly anti-democratic. 2nd period 1905 until 1907. Comparative freedom, commencement of the introduction of a certain democracy into the Party. 3rd period 1908 until 1910. Counter-revolution, no trace of democracy. 4th period, 1911 until 1914. Revival of labor movement, publication of the 'Pravda' in Petrograd, peculiar combination of legality and illegality. 5th period, complete illegality from August 1914 until 1917. During the whole of this time the C.C. consisted of two comrades only, Lenin and Zinoviev, who both lived in Switzerland. No trace of democracy. 6th period, 1917 until 1921. Civil War general mobilization, utmost exertion of powers. During this period a really military descipline existed in the Party. From the year 1921 onwards, the workers' democracy is spoken of." (Report at the Executive Committee of the Communist International, January 6, 1924. *Inprecor,* March 14, 1924, 171-2)

We see, then, that Lenin, Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev and the rest of the Bolshevik leaders had been burocrats years before 1917. "Lenin was expressly anti-democrat."*(Ib.)* Having observed that the leaders of bourgeois parties acquired posts of power, Lenin and his associates took a leaf from the bourgeois book and strove to achieve this goal. Since they were burocrats and Russian nationalists all their political life they merely continued as such, transferring the old burocratic methods of their political organization into the institutions of the State.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MARXISM AND THE BOLSHEVIK STATE

Workers Democratic World Government

VERSUS

National-Burocratic 'Soviet' and Capitalist Regimes

VOLUME THREE

Marx's and Engels' Burocratism and German Nationalism

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I.

THE NATIONALIST-BUROCRATIC SECOND INTERNATIONAL

1. *The Model Party of Pre-October Marxism*

SOMETIME AFTER the outbreak of the war of 1914 Trotsky wrote: "The Socialist parties of the epoch now concluded were national parties." *(Bolsheviki and World Peace,* 35). The Second International was a cluster of diverse groups lacking political and organizational harmony among themselves, all serving the interests of their respective bourgeois countries. It included the Fabian Society of Bernard Shaw and H. G. Wells, the British Labor Party, French Left Semi-Anarchists led by Herve, Italian Syndicalists, the Russian Mensheviks, Bolsheviks and SRs, numerous fraternal clubs, cooperatives, trade unions and Left reformist-pacifist organizations like the American Socialist Party which was ideologically influenced by muckrakers of the Upton Sinclair type. As the planets around the sun, the entire cluster revolved about the mighty German Social Democracy.

On the surface German Social Democracy was a paragon of revolutionary virtue, but beneath the surface it was a German patriotic labor society intoxicated with nationalism which it imbibed from the goblets of the ancient Teutonic epics and from the beer mugs of the modern German Empire. In the Second International among the greatest admirers of German Social Democracy, rather of its deceptive, learned, outwardly revolutionary appearance, were the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. During the War of 1914 Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring observed: "The German Social-Democracy was, as the 'Wiener Arbeiter-Zeitung' wrote on August 5th, 1914, the jewel of the organization of the class conscious proletariat. In its footsteps the French, the Italian and the Belgian Social Democracies, the labor movements of Holland, Scandinavia, Switzerland and United States followed more or less eagerly. The Slav nations, the Russians and the Social-Democrats of the Balkans looked up to the German movement in boundless, almost unquestioning admiration." *(The Crisis in the German Social-Democracy,* 10)

This assertion was but a confirmation of what Lenin himself had stated in 1914: "For the Social-Democrats of Russia, even somewhat more than for the Social-Democrats of the whole world, the German Social-Democracy was a model throughout the last decade." *(C. W.* XVIII, 92). And Trotsky in *Bolsheviks and the World Peace* acknowledged: "We are united by many ties to the German Social Democracy." (32)

An examination of pre-1914 German Social-Democracy yields a clear picture of a Party permeated with chauvinism. It was far from accidental, therefore, that on August 4, 1914 its hundred and ten representatives in the Reichstag voted credits for the Kaiser regime and defiantly declared to the whole world through Social Democratic

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

deputy Haase: "In the hour of danger we will not leave our Fatherland in the lurch." In the raging controversy which burst forth within the Second International following this move, Lenin stigmatized German Social-Democracy as a betrayer of Marx and Engels, while the German Social Democrats hotly denied the accusation. Which line of argument was true to facts? Let us see whether Marx and Engels would have supported the Kaiser regime in a war crisis?

2. *Engels' War Position*

The division of the European powers into two major camps which clashed in 1914 started with the Austro-German Alliance against Russia (May 1882). On the other side, France and Russia drew closely together and cemented their friendship with a pact (August 1891). The lines were set, the armament race was on and the world drifted toward the great catastrophe of 1914.

Friedrich Engels, friend and collaborator of Marx, the acknowledged political guide of the Second International, its spiritual head and specifically the spiritual head of German Social-Democracy, formulated his position on the forthcoming war in his correspondence with Bebel, a founder and leader of German Social Democracy and of the Second International. Writing a few weeks after the signing of the Franco-Russian entente, Engels said: "If we are convinced that the thing will start next spring, we could hardly be opposed to the credits on principle, and then we should be in a pretty desperate position. The lick-spittle parties would boast that they had been right, and that we had to eat our own words. Also, such an unexpected change of front would cause appalling friction within the party—and internationally as well." (October 13, 1891. Cited by Gustav Mayer in *Friedrich Engels,* 315)

In a clear and calculated way Engels set forth the policy of *no opposition* to military appropriations by the Kaiser government. At the same time he grasped that the gesture of support to the Junker regime would produce a crisis in the German section and in the International as a whole. The revolutionary workers would be disillusioned, realizing that all the beautiful "anti-government" speeches the Social Democratic deputies had delivered in the Reichstag were nothing but prattle which had fooled the masses.

Engels expanded his position along purely German national lines: "We cannot demand that the existing military organization should be completely altered while the danger of war persists. But if there is an attempt to take the great mass of men who are fit for service but have not been trained and train them as well as possible and dispose them in cadres—for real fighting, not for parading and all that nonsense—then that is an approach to our idea of the people's militia, which we can accept. If the danger of war increases, we can tell the government that we should be ready, if they made it possible

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

for us by decent treatment, to give our support against the foreign enemy—on the presupposition that they will fight relentlessly and use every means, even revolutionary means. If Germany is attacked from east and west, all means of self-defense are good. The existence of the nation is then at stake, and we, too, have a position to maintain and a future which we have won by hard fighting." (316)

There were no actual declarations of war as yet, only the diplomatic and military preparations for the coming conflict; yet Engels was making *his* preparations for the defense of the German Empire. He assigned to German Social Democracy the role of a political butler to Wilhelm II. Engels told his Social-Democratic comrades to extend servile overtures to the Prussian aristocracy "if the danger of war increases." In another letter to Bebel, dated September 29, 1891, Engels called the Kaiser's military machine "our army" and even offered a plan for German military operations! "Russia is weak in attack but strong in defensive man-power. A stab in the heart is impossible. France is strong in attack but rendered incapable of attack, innocuous, after a few defeats. I do not give much either for Austrians as generals or for Italians as soldiers, so our army will have to lead and sustain the main push. The war will have to begin with the holding back of the Russians but the defeat of the French." *(Selected Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* 489. Int. Pub.)

Unquestionably, in the event of a Kaiser victory, German militarism, bloated with pride and arrogance, would have enforced its mastery over Europe, and the jingoist intoxication of the German proletariat for at least a generation would have stood as an insurmountable obstacle in the struggle to overthrow the Junker regime. Yet Engels painted a different picture: "If we are victorious our Party will come into power. The victory of Germany is therefore the victory of the revolution, and if it comes to war we must not only desire victory but further it by every means." (490)

A portion of this letter, included in full in the Russian translation of the works of Marx and Engels issued by the Stalin burocracy, stated: "I shall see whether something can be done in France. It is necessary to call the attention of the French to certain things, but this must be done by the *French themselves.* People must understand that a war in alliance with Russia against Germany is at the same time a war against the strongest, military-capable Socialist Party in Europe, which will leave us no alternative but to drive upon each attacker who will be aiding Russia."

Is it a wonder then that on August 4, 1914 German Social Democracy, diseased with chauvinism which had been inculcated by Engels, rushed to the "defense" of the bourgeois fatherland which aimed, as its imperialist rivals, at conquest and enslavement!

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3. *Lenin and Zinoviev Shield Engels*

Lenin branded the leaders of European Social Democracy as betrayers of Socialism; but when the German Social Democrats asserted that by taking the stand of national defense they faithfully adhered to the tactical line of Engels, they told the truth. Lenin's reply to them was not merely evasive but actually disingenuous. One of his distortions read: "And since then up to Marx's death, even later, until 1890 when there was a threat of a reactionary war of Tsarism allied with France against *not an imperialist* but a nationally independent Germany, Engels stood first of all and more than anything else for a struggle against Tsarism." ("Discussion on Self-determination Summed up," *Against the Current,* R., 413). Lenin, an outstanding student of history, knew full well that the German Empire in 1890 was an *imperialist* power. Over a decade before, German capital had begun penetrating the South Seas Islands. In 1884 German financiers organized the Deutscher Kolonial Verein and in November of that year the German Imperial colors were raised on the East African Coast. At the same time a conference was called in Berlin (1884) to take up the partition of Africa. In April 1885 the German Government launched the German South-West Africa Co. and grabbed more African territory. German acquisitions were made in the north of New Guinea (Kaiser Wilhelmsland) and of many Pacific islands (The Bismarck Archipelago). Together with the advance of German imperialism went the suppression of colonial revolts. In 1888 the natives of East Africa rose in insurrection and drove out the German imperialists. A war of suppression was launched under Captain Wissman, the German military dictator in the held territory. On July 1, 1890 an arrangement was arrived at with Great Britain regarding spheres of influence in the African colonies. In Europe the German Empire included Alsace-Loraine and a portion of Poland. All this was well known to Lenin. Yet Lenin performed a sleight of hand and presented imperialist Germany as "*not an imperialist* but a nationally independent Germany . . ." which, therefore, Lenin contended, Engels was justified in supporting. But as often happens with the violators of truth, Lenin himself in his work *Imperialism* offered proof that by 1890 Germany was an imperialist power. *(S. W.* V, 70-71, 106)

There was another falsification Lenin added to the first. Engels' perspective was support to his German bourgeois fatherland, and in line with this perspective he stood for a combined struggle against Tsarist Russia and republican France. By 1890, however, Engels' own line that Tsarism was the chief prop to European reaction had undergone a change. In 1881 he wrote: "In the period of revolution of 1848-1849 not only the European monarchs but also the European bourgeoisie found in the Russian intervention the only safety against the rising strength of the proletariat. The Tsar was proclaimed the head of European reaction. Now he is confined in Gatchina as a war

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

prisoner of revolution, and Russia represents an advanced section of the revolutionary movement in Europe." (Cited in the Riazanov edition of the *Communist Manifesto* by Marx and Engels, R. 51). But Lenin reversed Engels' perspective on support to German imperialism by asserting: "Engels stood first of all and more than anything for a struggle against Tsarism."

Zinoviev in 1916 went Lenin one better. As we remember, Engels clearly offered lackey service of Social Democracy to the Prussian nobility and financiers of Germany in return for "decent treatment." The Zinoviev version of Engels' policy read "somewhat" different: "What then should the German proletariat, German Social Democracy do? Defend the Prussian junkers, support 'their own' government? No, this is impermissible! What then should they do, look on in silence while the forces of the Russian Tsar and of the French bourgeoisie crash into Germany? No, for Socialists this too is impermissible. Engels proposed something totally different: the German proletariat must overthrow its government, conduct a *revolutionary* war against Tsarism and unite with the French workers for the purposes of general struggle." *(Against the Current,* R. 472). This, clearly, was not Engels's position.

Despite all this vigorous pen-and-ink fabric, the truth is that Engels had set a chauvinist pattern for the German proletariat to follow, and when the war crisis finally erupted, the Social Democratic leaders faithfully adhered to that pattern.

4. *The Burocratic Disease*

The most respected individual in the German Party as well as in the International was Engels, and yet even he was treated burocratically and was compelled to declare that the crying need in his Party was freedom of expression. The heads of the Party overreached themselves in their burocratic machinations, and Engels sternly rebuked them. In a letter to Bebel he exclaimed: "What is the difference between you people and Puttkamer [Prussian Minister of Police—G. S.], if you pass antisocialist law against your own comrades? It does not matter to me personally. No party in the world can condemn me to be silent when I am determined to speak. But I think you should reflect whether you would not be wise to be a little less sensitive and a little less Prussian in your behavior. You—the party—need socialist science, and such science cannot exist unless there is freedom in the party." (Cited by Gustav Mayer in *Friedrich Engels,* 298-9)

The executives and functionaries in the International were "elected" through factional combination and very often were openly coopted or appointed from the top. Editors of the Party press received their posts through burocratic appointments, and Engels actively participated in approving or disapproving this or that appointee. (249)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In 1903-4 a serious discussion was conducted in the German Party on the issue of burocratism, but Kautsky and other leaders skillfully defended their veiled rule with democratic verbiage. The workers had been trained for decades to regard the burocratic permanency of the leading political and administrative officialdom in the Socialist movement as a healthy feature. While the class conscious workers were deceived, the bourgeoisie was not, and bourgeois opponents often ridiculed the sham democracy of the Socialist organizations. Socialist leaders, however, always shielded their burocratic system with the pretense that permanent tenure of the leadership was really an indication of the unity, democracy and trust existing in the movement. This protective tactic was mimicked by the Bolsheviks, the most authoritarian burocrats in the Second International. Lenin in 1902 in *What is to be Done* wrote: "Take the Germans. It will not be denied, I hope, that the German organizations embrace the crowd, that in Germany everything proceeds from the crowd, that the working class movement there has learned to walk. Yet observe how this vast crowd of millions values its 'dozen' tried political leaders, how firmly it clings to them! Members of the hostile parties in parliament often tease the Socialists by exclaiming: 'Fine democrats you are indeed! Your movement is a working class movement only in name; as a matter of fact, it is the same clique of leaders that is always in evidence, Bebel and Liebknecht, year in and year out, and that goes on for decades. Your deputies who are supposed to be elected from among the workers are more permanent than the officials appointed by the Emperor!' But the Germans only smile with contempt at these demagogic attempts to set the 'crowd' against the 'leaders,' to arouse bad and ambitious instincts in the former, and to rob the movement of its solidity and stability by undermining the confidence of the masses in their 'dozen wise men.' " *(S. W. II,* 135-6)

As a matter of fact, it was this placid mass confidence in the "dozen" top burocrats in every section of the Second International that enabled the latter to mislead and betray the masses.

CHAPTER II.

BUROCRATISM AND EARLY POLITICS OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

1. *An Undemocratic Beginning*

WE HAVE seen that the Second International, even prior to August 1914, was permeated with burocratism and nationalism. Let us therefore study the First International, the forerunner of the Second, and the role Marx and Engels played in that organization.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Contrary to the prevalent belief among many workers, Marx and Engels played no active role in the movement to found the First International. The immediate driving motive of the movement was the Polish issue, as Marx later explained: "Some time ago London workers had sent an address about Poland to Paris workers and summoned them to common action in this matter." (Letter to Engels, November 4, 1864. *Sel. Corr.* 159). A delegation representing Paris workers arrived in London and a public meeting was held on September 28, 1864 under the chairmanship of a liberal professor Beesly. Marx had been invited to attend. "Although for years I have systematically refused to take part in any 'organizations' I accepted this time because here there is a possibility of doing some real good." (Marx to Weydemeyer. Cited by Franz Mehring in *Karl Marx,* 349). Marx's participation was limited to sitting silently on the platform. Upon a motion of an English trade unionist it was decided to establish an international association and "appoint a committee, with power to add to its number, to draw up the rules and regulations for such an association." *(Founding of the First International,* 16). As can be seen, the organization from the very outset was invested with the burocratic powers of appointment and cooptation.

Marx was made a member of the Committee which included representatives of the Italian bourgeois patriot Mazzini, English trade unionists and former Chartists, Polish bourgeois patriots, French Proudhonists and utopian Socialists followers of Owen. Weston, an Owenite, drew up a declaration of principles; Major Wolfe, a Mazzinist, recommended the adoption of the rules of his Italian organization; Le Lubez, a Proudhonist, reworked in part the Weston program and read it at the General Council on October 18, 1864. "After reading of the above a long discussion took place, Mr. Worley objecting to the statement that the capitalists were opposed to the labourers." (24). Mr. Worley was given to understand by Marx and others that capital did stand in opposition to labor, "after which Mr. Cremer proposed, Marx seconded it: *That the programme as read by Le Lubez be adopted." (Ib.)*

Thus, it is unmistakably clear that at the meeting of the Committee on October 18, 1864 Marx seconded the adoption of an Owenite-Mazzinist program and rules. It is equally clear that at this session he an his co-thinker Eccarius voted for the substance of that Owenite-Mazzinist programmatic set of ideas, as the minutes further show: "Mr. Fontana then proposed, Lama seconded: That the substance of the programme be accepted. Carried unanimously."

In his report to Engels, Marx expressed his thoughts on the declaration of principles for which he had voted: "The General Committee met on October 18. As Eccarius had written me that delay would be dangerous I appeared, and was really frightened when I heard the worthy Le Lubez read out an appallingly wordy, badly written and utterly undigested preamble, pretending to be a declara-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tion of principles, in which Mazzini could be detected everywhere, the whole being crusted over with the vaguest tags of French socialism." (48; Letter to Engels, November 4, 1864)

Being inwardly against the miserable hotch-potch, but formally giving it his official support, Marx decided to maneuver in order to eliminate it and substitute his own programme. "Two days later, on October 20, Cremer (for the English), Fontana (Italy), and Le Lubez assembled in my house. (Weston was prevented). Hitherto I had never had the documents (those of Wolf and Le Lubez) in my hand so could not prepare anything, but was firmly determined that if possible not one single line of the stuff should be allowed to stand. In order to gain time I proposed that before we 'edited' the preamble we should 'discuss' the rules." (49)

The stratagem worked. "It was an hour after midnight by the time the first of forty rules was agreed to." Probably very fatigued, the visitors departed, leaving the matter entirely to Marx. "In order to justify the extremely strange way in which I intended to present the 'sentiment' already 'voted for,' I wrote *An Address to the Working Classes* (which was not in the original plan; a sort of review of the adventures of the working classes since 1845)." (49-50). Marx's description of the document he wrote known as the *Inaugural Address* was very apt. As compared with the *Communist Manifesto* the *Inaugural Address* is a pale piece of writing, without power of depth, it was a statistical review and criticism which could be accepted by virtually any Liberal. Little wonder that the document was hailed with enthusiasm in the politically-heterogenious Council. However, the inevitable Mr. Worley did have an objection. Calling the capitalists "profit mongers" grated on his delicate ears. "As an amendment Mr. Worley proposed and Mr. Wheeler seconded: *That the words 'profit mongers' be erased.*" (General Council meeting November 1, 1864, *Founding of the First International*, 26). Marx obligingly crossed out the words; and the Council expressed its appreciation for the document: "Mr. Wheeler then proposed and Mr. Dell seconded: That the thanks of the Central Council be given to Dr. Marx, Mr. Weston and M. Le Lubez for their exertions and the production of so admirable an address. Carried unanimously." (26)

The next problem which confronted the General Council was to establish an organ for the International, named International Workingmen's Association. The solution involved a virtually unbelievable machination. Instead of organizing an editorial board and founding a journal, the Council plunged into a scheme to wrest an existing paper, the *Beehive*, from a clique of trade union burocrats headed by Potter. The maneuver was to be executed by Odger and other trade union members of the Council who were part-owners of the paper. Some light on this business was shed by Marx in a letter to Engels dated December 2, 1864: "It is impossible, of course, to have a movement here without a press organ. Therefore the *Beehive* (weekly organ

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the trade unions) has been declared the organ of the association. Through a bit of hard luck, such as the workers often suffer, a rascal, George Potter (who figured in the *Times* as a mouth-piece in the building strikes with articles that were not written by him but by *others)* has entrenched himself—he is manager—with a clique of shareholders who form the majority up to now. It has therefore been decided by the committee, most of whose English members are *Beehive* shareholders (the share is only five shillings and no one can have more than five votes even if he owns five thousand shares; thus, one vote for each share up to a maximum of five) that a share fund be established by us enabling us to create shareholders and to swamp the old majority. I would like to have you too make a contribution for this purpose. Of course, the whole operation must take place among the close friends of the committee's members, otherwise the other side would take countersteps in time (i.e. before the general meeting of shareholders in the near future)." (80-81)

This strategem did not work. The wary Potter gang took counter measures and held the fort. Since Marx's plan foundered, one would think that the Council would abandon the game and use the money that went into the shares to launch a periodical of its own. But no! The Council adopted the tactic of seige. "The struggle for the possession of this paper and for its conversion into the organ of the International continued for a number of years." *(Ib.* "Notes," 81)

Thus, the International, the instrument which allegedly was formed to guide the proletariat toward emancipation, became a party to the factional quarrel between the Odger and Potter trade union burocrats. The affair threatened to become a public scandal. Meanwhile, through the offices of Odger and Applegarth who were on the editorial staff of the *Beehive,* the documents of the International were appearing in that publication, buried under the inane rubbish of general "public" interest items. At length, after five years of this disgraceful carnival, the Council's wish to capture the *Beehive* passed into the limbo of shattered hopes. Potter and his friends sold the paper to a woolen manufacturer. Marx's motion to sever all connections with the paper was carried unanimously in the Council, but the two members of the Council, Applegarth and Odger, evidently enamoured of the new boss, kept their posts on the *Beehive.*

2. *An Example of the Early Political Line of the General Council*

The International was organized at the time of the Civil War in the United States. The General Council felt called upon to give its position on this issue and Marx secured a decision from the Council to send an address to Lincoln. A number of the English members of the General Council took a position to the Right of Marx and proposed that the Address be introduced to the United States minister to England, Charles F. Adams, not by the Council but by a Liberal

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

member of Parliament. On the other hand, Le Lubez argued that the Council send the Address "to the American people," a line slightly to the Left of Marx.

The Address was written by Marx. It withheld the truth that Lincoln had been elected on a pro-slavery platform, that if it had not been for the secessionist move of the South the continuation of slavery would have been assured under Lincoln. Lincoln's prolonged reluctance to abolish slavery during the Civil War was concealed by Marx. Unquestionably Marx was familiar with Lincoln's proclamation after the battle of Antietam (September 17, 1862) suggesting to the Confederate States that they return to the Union on the basis of retention of slavery. No doubt, too, Marx knew of Lincoln's reactionary reply to Horace Greeley, publisher of the New York *Daily Tribune,* who wrote an appeal to Lincoln entitled "The Prayer of Twenty Million" in which he showed how contradictory were Lincoln's "attempts to put down the rebellion and at the same time uphold its inciting cause." Lincoln's position was: "My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it; if I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it; and if I could do it by freeing some and leaving others alone, I would also do that."

Despite the obvious advantage to the South, Lincoln stubbornly held on to slavery in the face of strong abolitionist sentiment, and on December 1, 1862, in a message to Congress, proposed that slavery continue till 1900 by which date it should be eliminated gradually with monetary compensation to the slaveholders. However, on January 1, 1863, strictly as a war measure, he issued The Emancipation Proclamation, which was concretized by the sweep of the Northern Armies over the Southern States. It must be noted that Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation did not actually abolish slavery; in the Border States—Kentucky, West Virginia, Maryland and Missouri, and certain occupied territories the slavery institution was allowed to continue. Only on December 18, 1865 by the Thirteenth Amendment to the U. S. Constitution, adopted after the assassination of Lincoln, were the Negroes released from bondage—almost a year after Marx published the Address to Lincoln (Jan. 7, 1865).

Before being elected President, Lincoln had stooped to the White chauvinist prejudices of the slaveholders. In his debate with Douglas at Charleston, Illinois, Lincoln declared: "I am not, nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races; that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters of the free Negroes, or jurors, or qualifying them to hold office, or having them marry with white people. I will say in addition that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which, I suppose, will forever forbid the two races living together upon terms of social and political equality; and inasmuch as they cannot so live, that while they do remain

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

together, there must be the position of the superiors and the inferiors; and that I, as much as any other man, am in favor of the superior position being assigned to the white man." (W. E. Woodward, *A New American History,* 500)

Marx not only withheld all reference to Lincoln's true attitude toward the fate of the Negro but he deliberately distorted the *class* nature of the Washington Government. Whereas in the *Communist Manifesto* he and Engels had clearly stated: "The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie," in the Address to Lincoln, Marx created the impression that the capitalist power of the North was a *workers* republic: "the workingmen, the true political power of the North, allowed slavery to defile *their own republic* . . ." (Our emph.—G. S.). Lastly, Marx described Lincoln as one of the proletariat and obscured the fact that economically and politically Lincoln was strengthening the capitalist system and the enslavement of the proletariat: "The workingmen of Europe feel sure that, as the American War of Independence initiated a new era of ascendancy for the middle class, so the American anti-slavery war will do for the working classes. They consider it an earnest of the epoch to come that it fell to the lot of Abraham Lincoln, the single-minded son of the working class, to lead the country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an enchained race and the reconstruction of a social world."

We divert here a moment to show how the Stalin burocrats, to cover up Marx, circulate the false picture of Lincoln's attitude toward Negro slavery: "Abraham Lincoln . . . he was known as an opponent of slavery." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LI, 704). "A. Lincoln, a violent opponent of slavery . . ." *(Enc. Slovar Granat,* XLI, Part 6, 303, Seventh Ed.)

Upon the assassination of Lincoln Andrew Johnson became President. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* states: "Lincoln, who had the confidence of the masses of the victorious North, was replaced by Johnson, opinionated and intemperate, whose antecedents as a Tennessean and Democrat, and whose state rights' principles and indifference to Northern ideals of the future of the Negro made him distrusted by large numbers of the Union Republican party." (XXVII, 711)

Marx also penned an Address to President Johnson carrying the same deception about "the reconstruction of a social world" by the political representatives of the American capitalists. "A profound sense of your great mission will save you from any compromise with stern duties. You will never forget that to initiate the new era of the emancipation of labor, the American people devolved the responsibilities of leadership upon two men of labor—the one Abraham Lincoln, the other Andrew Johnson." *(Civil War in the U. S.* Int. Pub. 285)

Marx, of course, could not have failed with his wide range of vision to realize that in America there was unfolding not a "new era

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the emancipation of labor" but a new era of unprecedented capitalist expansion.

On June 24, 1865, a few weeks after dispatching the Address to President Johnson, Marx wrote to Engels: "I don't like Johnson's policy. Ludicrous fits of sternness against individual persons; but up to now he is very vacillating and weak in actuality. Reaction in America has already started and will soon grow very strong, if this slackness will not be put an end to." Engels replied on July 15, 1865: "I too do not like Mr. Johnson's policy." On August 27, 1867 Marx, in a letter to Vermorel, gave a characterization of Johnson altogether different from the one in the official Address: "President Johnson, that dirty tool of the slaveholders . . ."

It is worth noting that prior to the formation of the International, Marx and Engels were quite uncomplimentary in their view of Lincoln. In words that allow no double interpretation Engels wrote contemptuously of Lincoln's administration: "What cowardice in government and Congress. They are afraid of conscription, of resolute financial steps, of attacks on slavery, of everything that is urgently necessary; they let everything loaf along as it will, and if the semblance of some measure finally gets through Congress, the honorable Lincoln so qualifies it that nothing at all is left of it any longer." (Letter to Marx, July 30, 1862; *C. W. in U. S.* 251). Writing to Engels on October 29, 1862, over a month after Lincoln had issued his preliminary proclamation of emancipation (Sep. 22, 1862), Marx said: "All Lincoln's Acts appear like the mean pettifogging conditions which one lawyer puts to his opposing lawyer." (258). This was a different language from the one Marx later *officially* used before the workers in the public Address when he designated Lincoln as the "single-minded son of the working class."

Nor did Marx resort, in private, to any distortion of the class nature of the North American Republic. What he falsely described in the Address to Lincoln as the workers' own republic he had presented in these clear class terms: "The manner in which the North wages war is only to be expected from a *bourgeois* republic, where fraud has so long reigned supreme." (Letter to Engels, September 10, 1862, 255)

Did Marx and Engels ever let the proletariat know their private views on Lincoln and Johnson? They never did. The misrepresentations contained in the Addresses have been used for decades by the burocrats of all the Internationals, especially by the Stalinists, to concoct a false history of the American Civil War.

Another classic example of Marx's two-faced attitude on important political figures was his line on Lincoln's Secretary of State, Seward. Three years before the formation of the International Marx described Seward in these terms: "Seward manifestly regarded the Secretaryship of State as a mere preliminary step, and was less preoccupied with the 'irrepressible conflict' of the present than with the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

presidency of the future. He has provided fresh proof that virtuosos of the lungs are dangerously inadequate statesmen. Read his state dispatches! What a repulsive mixture of greatness of phrase and smallness of mind, of mimicry of strength and acts of weakness!" *(Die Presse,* November 26, 1861; *C. W. in U. S.* 99)

Apropos of the removal of Southern agents from the British steamer *Trent,* Marx stated with respect to Seward: "If the naval exploit hastens Seward's removal from the Washington Cabinet, the United States will have no reason to record it as an 'untoward event' in the annals of its Civil War." (103)

If there was a true American imperialist in the United States Government, it was Seward. The bourgeois historians, Charles and Mary Beard, offer a brief sketch of Seward's ambitious predatory plans and intrigues with robber powers abroad for aggression against backward Oriental countries: "In Lincoln's day Seward had declared that the United States ought to command the empire of the seas and that the vast Pacific basin was to become the chief theater of world events in the coming years." *(The Rise of American Civilization,* II, 491)

Seward popularized the famous phrase describing the struggle between North and South as the "irrepressible conflict" but he did all he could to repress the conflict in favor of benevolent peace with the slave-owning aristocracy, even to the point of promising to evacuate Fort Sumter. Marx was fairly clear as to the reactionary essence of Seward's public activity. Yet in the International's Address to Andrew Johnson (May 20, 1865) Marx used this language: "To be singled out by the side of such a chief, the second victim to the infernal gods of slavery, was an honor due to Mr. Seward. Had he not, at a time of general hesitation, the sagacity to foresee and the manliness to foretell 'the irrepressible conflict'? Did he not, in the darkest hours of that conflict, prove true to the Roman duty to never despair of the republic and its stars? We earnestly hope that he and his son will be restored to health, public activity, and well-deserved honors within much less than '90 days.' " *(C. W. in U. S.* 284)

It is evident that in political gyrations Marx was not to be outdone by his future disciples, the founders of the Bolshevik State.

3. *Burocratic Considerations*

Marx's practice was to give comfort to undisguised reformism within the General Council of the International. To take a concrete case, a Rightist-reformist paper *The Commonwealth* was owned by certain members of the General Council. Marx said something about this in a letter to Kugelmann of October 9, 1866: "The Commonwealth belongs to our people, but at the moment (partly for economic and partly for political reasons) has become a purely reform organ."

Marx failed to expound upon these economic and political reasons that prompted "our people" to run a reformist paper. A few

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

months later he again wrote to Kugelmann that the International had reason for letting the paper spread reactionary notions among the workers, and he again avoided explaining precisely the true reasons for doing so. At the same time Marx admitted that he and others could intervene and change the editorial policy of the paper: "The Commonwealth is up to its neck in the reform movement. Its editorship is in very bad hands. At the moment we have reasons for letting it go on as it is, although we could intervene as share-holders." (Letter to Kugelmann, Feb. 18, 1867)

An excellent illustration of the burocratic character of the General Council is the case of a political adventurer, Holyoake, a non-member of the International, attempting to become a member of the General Council. Marx described the attempt to Engels and asked advice on policy: "Incident of last Council sitting. Mr. Holyoake makes his appearance—be every man his own Cromwell—and after his departure his candidacy is presented through Weston. Meanwhile it was pointed out that his candidacy cannot even be proposed until he has secured a membership card of the International Workingmen's Association. He wanted simply to give himself airs and have the opportunity to parade at the next sitting of the General Council as a delegate! Since he has many friends among our people, the debate on the question of his admission will be a stormy one. In the capacity of a frustrated intriguer he can do us plenty of damage. What tactic, in your opinion, should I adopt?" (Marx to Engels, Nov. 18, 1869. XXIV, R. 251). Engels' reply was: "The story with Holyoake is of a perilous nature. This worthy is a real go-between the radical bourgeoisie and the workers. The essence of the matter is as follows: is the composition of the General Council such that we must be wary against swamping it with too many people of this sort, or not? If you are to accept Holyoake, then others may try to get in, and will try as soon as the International becomes a more considerable force. And when more serious times arrive these gentlemen undoubtedly will attend the sessions and will attempt to take the leadership into their hands. So far as I know, Mr. Holyoake never did anything at all for the working class *as such*. A priori everything speaks against his acceptance. But if as a result of refusal a split situation develops in the Council, while on the other hand, his admission in practice may only create insignificant changes in the composition of the General Council, then it's all right to take him in. And yet I cannot imagine a workers Council with such a character in its midst." (Nov. 19, 1869. *Ib.* 253)

Paying lip service to decency and proletarian-revolutionary principle of organization, Marx and Engels, as can be seen from this exchange of ideas, were motivated by burocratic expediency.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Toward the Burocratic End of the International*

Not long after its formation the General Council became a seething cauldron of internal dissention which soon overflowed and inundated the entire International. Petty personal rivalries, burocratic jealousies and intrigue, bitter feuds and the utter political incompatibility of the totally heterogeneous elements, trends, camps and schools which Marx had momentarily held together by means of his *Address,* were rending the organization asunder. Month after month the internal situation grew more aggravated. The eventual entry of Bakunin and his Anarchists turned the organization into a factional Bedlam.

During the ebb and flow of the life of the International, the powers of the General Council continued to increase to unforeseen proportions. The Basle Congress (September 1869) invested the Council with dictatorial authority. It was given the power to suspend from membership any section found guilty of violating the "spirit" of the International, pending the next congress. Bakunin, whose Anarchist principles presumably dictated opposition to all authority, heartily supported this highly burocratic move.

The acme of the burocratic disease was reached at the Hague Congress (September 1872), the first and only Congress attended by Marx. The International was already cracking up due to the fierce factional struggle between Marx and Bakunin. Marx made extensive preparations for the Congress. The manner in which he recruited supporters and secured a majority of delegates is amply mirrored in his letter to Kugelmann, dated July 29, 1872. Otto Ruhle, a bosom comrade of Karl Liebknecht, cited a portion of Marx's letter to Kugelmann and added a word of his own comment: " 'The Congress is a life-and-death question for the International,' Marx had written to Kugelmann. 'Before I resign from the General Council, I want at least to free the International from disintegrating elements. Germany, therefore, must have as many representatives as possible. Write to Hepner and tell him that I shall be glad if he will procure for you a mandate as delegate.' Thus Marx was carefully organizing the personnel of the Hague Congress just as he had carefully organized that of the London Conference. This was to be a decisive battle, in which he would gain a definitive victory over Bakunin." *(Karl Marx,* 302)

In the course of packing the Congress Marx pulled every possible string: "As it turned out, Marx had written to his friend Sorge in America to bring along a dozen blank mandates from the American sections. Carrying out this order Sorge brought twelve unfilled mandates and turned them over to Marx who distributed them among his loyal followers. When Herman Jung learned of this fact he inquired of Marx whether this was true? Marx did not deny that he had asked Sorge to fetch along a few extra mandates and added that Sorge was a stupid jackass for revealing this." (James Guillaume and N. Lebedev, *Karl Marx and the International,* R. 122). With respect to the charge

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

that Marx imported blank mandates from America and distributed them to his French and German followers, Franz Mehring writes: "It is true, however, that in June, Marx had written to America asking for mandates to be sent for French and German members." *(Karl Marx,* 511). Thus Marx's majority at the Hague Congress was secured not through democratic elections by the rank-and-file on the basis of support to political ideas and platforms but through the mechanical distribution of mandates from above. Germany was to have not a definite proportion of delegates in ratio to the membership but, as Marx told Kugelmann, "as many representatives as possible."

At the Lenin-Trotsky and the Stalin burocratic Congresses at least the *appearance* of democratic distribution of votes was preserved. Each delegate had one vote and no more. Things were different in the First International, particularly at the Hague Congress: "This was the first Congress at which Marx was present; he came as a member of the General Council, and had, besides, three mandates Mainz, Leipzig, and New York). Engels, in addition to his vote as member of the General Council, had a vote for Breslau and a vote for New York. In these circumstances it was not difficult for Marx to control a majority, especially seeing that Bakunin's Italian supporters had abstained from sending delegates. Marx was sure of a victory before the fight had begun." (Ruhle, 302-3)

At the opening session of the Congress the hall was crowded with workers, as reported by a French newspaper correspondent: "The workers certainly did not fail to put in an appearance. Never have I seen a crowd so packed, so serious, so anxious to see and hear." (Cited by Nicolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen in *Karl Marx,* 360). Marx at the public sessions of the Congress castigated the bourgeois reaction which was raging in Europe following the suppression of the Paris Commune, and the workers applauded the denunciation of their oppressors. But there was another side of the Congress which in the familiar pattern later followed by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin at their congresses, was hidden from the workers. Behind closed doors a factional intrigue was taking place some details of which eventually came to light. With unflagging determination Marx was demanding more power for the General Council which he now fully controlled. "The discussion ended on the fifth day of the Congress behind closed doors just as the discussion on the mandates had, by the way, also taken place behind closed doors. In a long speech Marx demanded not only that the previous powers of the General Council should be maintained, but even increased. The General Council should be given the right to suspend, under certain conditions, not only individual sections, but whole federations pending the decisions of the next congress." (Mehring, *Karl Marx,* 513-514)

The Marx majority at the Congress expressed its willingness to support this gross burocratic move. Marx thereby established a historical precedent for Lenin and Zinoviev to invest their Comintern

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Executive with similar powers of suspension of undesired sections. Following the passage of the resolution for enlarged powers to the General Council a proposal was made which stunned the Congress: "When the ballot was over Engels rose and proposed in his own and Marx's name that the headquarters of the General Council be transferred from London to New York. This caused an indescribable sensation." (N. and M-H. *Karl Marx,* 361). The bewilderment at this proposal is evidence that Marx and Engels never let even their own majority at the Congress know in advance what they had been planning.

In the steadily narrowing burocratic-centralist frame-work of the General Council, Marx and Engels, as Lenin and Trotsky after October, showed mistrust and fear of the workers. Describing this important moment at the Hague, Mehring gives indications of the diplomatic trickery which climaxed the life of the First International: "It is always a disagreeable matter to use diplomatic methods in proletarian affairs. Marx and Engels had feared with good reason that their proposal to move the General Council from London to New York would meet with vigorous resistance from the German, French and English workers, and they had concealed their intentions as long as possible in order not to add to the already numerous points of contention. However, the fact that they were successful in surprising the Hague congress nevertheless had evil consequences. The resistance they had feared was not diminished thereby, but rather intensified and embittered." (517). Of course Mehring writes in a vein of forgiveness because of the supposedly good intentions behind the diplomatic trickery of the leaders of the First International.

When Engels made his astonishing proposal, many of the supporters of Marx shrank from upholding the motion, and even those who voted in favor felt sour about the matter. The resolution was carried by a bare majority of 26 to 23.

The measure had been prompted by the fear on Marx's part that his factional enemies would eventually seize control of the International, as can be plainly seen from his letter to Sorge on September 27, 1873: "According to my view of conditions in Europe, it will be thoroughly useful to let the formal organization of the International withdraw into the background for a time, only, if possible, keeping some control over the centre in New York in order to prevent idiots like Perret or adventurers like Cluseret getting hold of the leadership and compromising the cause." *(Sel. Cor.* 164-5). The decision to remove the International's headquarters from Europe, then the main arena of the proletarian struggle, was in effect a move for its liquidation. The refugee Communards, Vaillant, Ranvier and others, all Blanquists, left the Congress in disgust and indignation. In a leaflet which they subsequently issued they stated: "Called upon to do its duty, the International collapsed. It fled from the revolution over the Atlantic Ocean."

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

While the decision evoked a storm among the revolutionary workers who saw in the International an instrument of resistance against reaction, Marx pictured the step as of benefit to them. He was going to fool the bourgeoisie: "Moreover, it will upset the calculations of the governments on the Continent that at the very moment when their *crusade of reaction* is about to begin the spectre of the International should refuse its services for the time being, and that indeed the bourgeoisie everywhere should believe the ghost to have been successfully laid." (165)

5. *Marx Uses a Frame Up Tactic Against an Opponent*

The crowning touch of Marxist burocratism at the Congress was the method employed to expel Bakunin. Had Marx and Engels taken up Bakunin's program, exposed its basically reactionary content, and then asked for his expulsion, this would have appeared objective. But a political action against Bakunin would have lacked logic and force because on March 9, 1869, in taking up the question of allowing the Bakuninists to affiliate to the International, the General Council, at the instance of Marx, had passed a decision that it was not its affair to evaluate the theories and programs of the groups and parties joining the International. (Mehring, *Karl Marx,* 437). When Bakunin's Alliance of Socialist Democracy had first applied for affiliation to the International, Marx, through the General Council, rejected the request. He had qualms about Bakunin not on programmatic but on *national* grounds. Writing to Engels, he said: "Herr Bakunin—who is at the back of this affair—is kind enough to want to take the workers' movement under *Russian* control." (Cited by Nicolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen, 288). Engels, too, feared Bakunin on national grounds. He even added a geographical touch to the difference between Bakunin and the Marxists in a letter to Marx dated February 25, 1869: "Regarding Bakunin I wrote to Borkheim telling him to raise the question of whether, in general, any collaboration is possible between us Westerners and this Pan-Slavist trash as long as these heroes preach their Slav hegemony." *(Wks.* XXIV, R. 164). Marx was unconcerned about Bakunin's program: "As to the program of the 'Alliance', the General Council need not put it under a critical examination." (Letter to Engels, March 5, 1869. *Ib.,* 172). Marx did object to one phrase—"equalization of classes," but regarded it as an inadvertent error: "But from the context in which this phrase appears in the program it is apparent that it is a slip of the pen. Therefore the General Council does not doubt in the least that this phrase which may give rise to dangerous misunderstandings, will be eliminated from the program. With this condition, in conformity with the principles of the International Workingmen's Association, each section is responsible for its own program. Therefore, there are no barriers whatsoever to the transformation of the sections of the Alliance into sections of the International Workingmen's Association." *(Ib.)*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Several months later Engels again raised the issue of Bakunin's Pan-Slavism: "If this accursed Russian really intends to worm his way, by means of intrigues, into the leadership of the workers' movement, then it is time to teach him a lesson and pose the question whether a pan-Slavist in general can be a member of the International Workingmen's Association." (Letter to Marx, July 30, 1869. *Ib.* 224). However, on June 2, 1869, over a month before Engels wrote this, Bakunin had announced the dissolution of his Alliance and was thereupon accepted into the International with his own program for the Geneva Section which he headed. It is clear then that when Marx wanted to expel Bakunin he had to do so on other than theoretical-programmatic grounds.

Sometime before, Bakunin had received from a Russian publisher 300 rubles as an advance payment for the translation of the first volume of Marx's *Capital*. Bakunin failed to perform the work and was prevented by extremely pressing circumstances from repaying the advance. However, the publisher's agent kept demanding the return of the money. At length the agent, Liubavin, received a threatening letter, bearing the signature "Omsky," warning him to stop bothering Bakunin. Marx obtained this letter. It was accompanied with a note to him from Liubavin who expressed doubt whether Bakunin himself had a hand in drawing up or sending the letter. (Mehring 516). Bakunin himself vigorously denied any knowledge of the contents of the letter. On the whole the incident with the 300 rubles was of a very petty nature, was of a private character and could have been eventually adjusted between Bakunin and the publisher. Nevertheless, Marx and Engels made this insignificant incident seem like a crime of staggering proportions.

Concerning Liubavin's belief that Bakunin had nothing to do with sending the letter, Mehring stated: "This was in fact the truth, but merely on the basis of this letter, whose addressee himself considered it not sufficiently incriminating as far as Bakunin was concerned, the latter was accused by the Hague Congress of a contemptible piece of roguery." *(Ib.)*

Another biographer of Marx, who, like Mehring, maintained silence over many burocratic doings in the First International, also could not refrain from adopting a sharp tone when he reviewed the method whereby Marx secured the expulsion of Bakunin: "Such was the rope used by Marx to hang his enemy—Marx who had been involved in a thousand shady financial transactions, and had lived all his life as pensioner on a friend's bounty." (Ruhle, 304)

Abstractly speaking, there is of course nothing reprehensible about a person living on the bounty of friends or borrowing from people if his labors are of scientific value. And certainly it was no crime on Bakunin's part when he, oppressed by desperate poverty and illness, was unable to fulfil his contract to the publisher and had no means of raising the money to return the advance payment.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mehring correctly asks: "How many authors, including many of the most famous, have not at some time or other found themselves in the position of having spent their advance and unable to perform the promised work?" (517)

Even some of the Stalinist burocrats have been constrained to exonerate Bakunin: "The accusation of swindling (the affair with the advance for the translation of *Capital)* was unjust. Here Bakunin suffered for the Nechaiev method of liquidating accounts of which he was not guilty." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* IV, 447)

6. *The Investigating Committee*

The Hague Congress appointed a committee to investigate Bakunin's case. In the report the Committee submitted to the Congress there resounded a distinct note which would have caused any objective judge to pause before acquiescing in the verdict of guilty: "Cuno, the president of the Committee, declared that, though the committee had received no material proof of the guilt of the accused, it had, nevertheless, acquired a moral conviction of his guilt." (G. M. Stekloff, *History of the First International,* 238)

Marx placed before the Committee the question of the illegal existence of the Alliance within the International. The Committee, however, declared that it found no evidence that the Alliance then existed. (Cited by James Cuillamme, *The International,* R., 308-9)

In resorting to the means he did to oust his chief opponent, Marx enmeshed himself in a ludicrous contradiction. Had Bakunin pocketed money collected from the workers on the promise of using it for the movement, as have for example certain Stalinist leaders, one would have been more than justified in exposing and expelling him. But Bakunin's case involved a private affair with a capitalist publisher, and Marx himself said that it is the capitalist who appropriates other people's labor and property. The contradiction in which Marx entangled himself by accusing Bakunin of embezzling bourgeois property did not escape Ruhle's eye: "But that Marx, in order to secure this concrete triumph, should have stooped to personal calumny, is a condemnation, not of Bakunin, but of Marx himself. We have here a deplorable demonstration of the disastrous trait in his character which made him regard all the problems of politics, the labor movement, and the revolution, from the outlook of their bearing on his personal credit. A council of international revolutionaries, whose main business in life is to blow to smithereens the world of private property and bourgeois morality, is induced by its leader to pass a vote of reprobation and a sentence of expulsion. . . . on the ground that this revolutionist has misappropriated bourgeois property. Is it possible to point to anything more painfully absurd in the whole story of the human race?" (304)

What Ruhle failed to grasp was that the "council of international revolutionaries" was a gathering of burocrats. One can unequivocally

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

agree with Gustav Mayer when he says: "It would be unfair to blame Bakunin for calling the congress a 'sorry product of lies and intrigue' after his unjust condemnation. Marx deserves censure for extending the war against his political opponent into private life, and Engels for not dissuading him from this course." *(Friedrich Engels,* 225)

As every other burocratic congress, whether under Marx and Engels, or Lenin and Trotsky, or Stalin, the Hague Congress could have been nothing else but a shabby affair. What Mayer, Ruhle and others failed to grasp is the *scientific* meaning of the factional frame-up of Bakunin. Instead of realizing that the affair was but a symptom of a historical disease afflicting the proletariat they placed the blame on a specific person, in this instance on Marx.

Noteworthy in this affair is the fact that the verdict of the Investigating Committee was not at all unanimous. Of the five members, three were authentic supporters of Marx and Engels. Giving scant consideration to scruples, they accepted the Bakunin-publisher tangle as grounds for recommending the expulsion. One member of the Committee, however, rejected the charges and pronounced Bakunin not guilty. The fifth member soon after was exposed as a spy. Indeed this fact alone invalidated the decision of the Committee, as Mehring correctly observed: "The concluding scene of the Hague Congress was certainly unworthy of it. Naturally, the congress could not know that the decisions of the majority of the committee were invalid because one member was a police spy." (Mehring, 516)

Any objective person will agree with Mehring that the decision which was secured with the aid of a vote of a police spy was invalid. Oddly, the men who achieved scholarly renown as the greatest theoretical critics of the bourgeoisie sank to the base bourgeois level of frame-up and the indirect utilizing of the service of a police spy to gain their factional ends.

Every burocrat describes his shabby methods of struggle against his factional opponents as the quintescence of decency. Marx and Engels portrayed the affair as an honorable act. Engels wrote to Bebel on June 20, 1873: "We have now got rid of the rotten elements with honor to ourselves—" *(Sel. Cor.* 326)

7. *An Achievement or an Obstacle?*

The First International with the poison of burocratism and intrigue flowing through its veins was not an instrument to lead the world oppressed toward emancipation. People who lack political realism, like Otto Ruhle, blind hero-worshippers who do not attempt to pierce through the maze of legends, fail to realize that *such* an organization could only produce fatal results for the proletariat. Ruhle writes: "The painful feelings aroused in us by Marx's campaign against Bakunin, and the moral judgment we may be inclined to pronounce on the former's uncomradely behavior, must not lead us

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

astray, must not incline us to overlook how immense an achievement was the foundation of the International." (307)

That the proletariat was in need of a world organization is indisputable. But there was only one kind of an organization that the proletariat required: a body ideologically guided by correct revolutionary theories and directed by a democratically-elected, intellectually-honest and morally healthy collective leadership, completely responsible to the workers for every act and policy.

A combination of burocratic leadership and State power can bring only disastrous consequences for the masses because burocrats view the organization they head as their private property. Revolution is given a personal slant by their burocratic mind. If Louis XIV, for example, dictatorially asserted that he and the French State were identical, Marx, due to his personal burocratic outlook, considered himself one with the International. Thus, writing to Kugelmann on February 23, 1865, he remarked: "On the whole the progress of this 'Association' is *beyond all expectations*, here, in Paris, in Belgium, Switzerland, and Italy. Only in Germany, of course, Lassalle's successors oppose me."

One of the chief problems which Marx and Engels saw in connection with the International was the tightening of Marx's personal control. Engels wrote to Marx with special stress: "The more significant becomes the affair the more important it is that *you* retain it in your hands." (August 6, 1868. XXIV, R. 85). In September 1867, when Marx's position in the International was still fairly stable, he wrote grandiosely to Engels: "Things are moving. And in the next revolution, which is perhaps nearer than it appears, *we* (i.e., you and I) will have this powerful engine in *our hands*." *(Sel. Corr.* 227)

Such remarks demand no special political elucidation. Marx did not think even of the General Council in terms of *group* activity, let alone of the proletarian members of the International! *"You and I"*—the idea of *two* foremost leaders holding the organization in their hands could lead, in the event of proletarian revolution, only to a system of appointive power from the top, with the two leaders themselves in the role later played by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. The organizational mind of Marx and Engels had always been running exclusively along the burocratic line of self-appointment. Indications of this are scattered throughout their private correspondence. For instance, reporting to Engels about meeting a deputation of a group of German political refugees in London, Marx wrote on May 18, 1859: "That old-Weitlinger ass Scherzer thought *he* could nominate Party representatives. When *I* met a deputation of the *Knoten* (I have refused to join any association, but Liebknecht [was nominated] chairman of one and the Lapp [Anders] of the other) I told them straight out: We had received our appointment as representatives of the proletarian party from nobody *but ourselves*. It was, however, endorsed by the exclusive and universal hatred consecrated to us by all the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

parties and fractions of the old world. You can imagine how staggered the blockheads were." (122-3)

The private correspondence of Marx and Engels is replete with melodramatic flights of dictatorial fancy. In February 1851 Engels said to Marx: "Now at last, at long last, we have another opportunity to show that we do not need the support of any party in any country, and that our position is entirely independent of any such nonsense. From now on we are responsible for ourselves alone. When the time comes and our fine friends need us, we can dictate our own terms." (Cited by Mayers 141)

The First International was not the property of the proletariat but was, in the full political sense of the term, the private burocratic property of Marx and Engels. Marx practiced the well-known method of placing his own men in key positions at the Congresses of the International the better to control the factional situation. Thus in his preparations for the Geneva Congress he "elected" his close supporter, Jung, through personal instructions from London: "It is absolutely necessary that Jung be the Chairman of the Congress." (Letter to Becker, August 31, 1866. XXV, R. 475)

Like all other burocratic leaders, Marx and Engels, dominated by the passion for personal control, held in contempt resolutions adopted by the Congresses of the International when not to their liking. This is seen from Engels' private remark to Marx in which he intimated that as long as Marx controlled the General Council they could disregard the decisions of the Lausanne Congress (September, 1867) which had come under the control of their opponents: "This time the French, evidently, indeed won the Congress, the number of Proudhonist resolutions was too great. It is a good thing that the next Congress will gather in Belgium, and that at about that time it will be possible to accomplish something in Northern Germany, and then, with the aid of the English a barrier will be placed before this tendency. However, in general these decisions have no significance whatsoever as long as the General Council remains in London." (Sept. 11, 1867. XXIII, R. 443)

That burocratic corruption was deeply imbedded in Marx's consciousness is sharply illustrated by the fact that he even viewed the seizure by the police of *internal* opponents as being of practical factional value to himself. Thus, while he was busy with preparations to give battle to the Proudhonists at the forthcoming Brussels Congress, the Paris section of the International, dominated by them, was tracked down by Bonaparte's police. Previously Marx had been irked to learn that the Paris branch had prepared a program for the Congress. The members of the branch were discussing various aspects of the program when the police struck. To Marx the police action and court proceedings against the Paris branch were a welcome surprise: "The French Government has opened the case against the Paris Committee of the International Workingmen's Association (as an illegal

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

society). I am very much satisfied since this prevented these asses from continuing the discussion of their program which they prepared for the Congress of 1868." (Letter to Engels, January 11, 1868. XXIV, R. 11). Marx took the imprisonment of his organizational comrades as a fortunate occurrence primarily because, with the exception of one delegate, his enemies would thus be kept away from the Brussels Congress. Writing to Engels on August 28, 1868, Marx actually revealed that in this instance he welcomed the indirect aid of the French police: "*Fortunately* our people in Paris are in prison. The Paris committee will send one delegate to Brussels; various *corps de metier*—about eight or nine." (91)

The Hague Congress was a burocratic wind up of the burocratic First International. That its demise was at Hague was acknowledged by Engels in a letter to Sorge in September 1874. There remained not a single national federation behind the General Council—Bakunin took over almost all, even a large part of the British section. Marx and Engels climaxed their ownership by placing one of their own men in charge of liquidating the International which was slipping out of their hands and was therefore no longer of any use to them: "Upon the insistence of Marx and Engels, their old friend Sorge, who long before had settled in America, was chosen General Secretary. He clearly understood that in actuality he had been assigned the task of decently liquidating the outlived organization by not permitting unclean or inexperienced hands to seize its honorable banner." (U. M. Steklov, *History of the Workers Movement, The Three Internationals,* R., 162)

How "honorable" the banner of the First International was one can judge by the moral decay and cynicism manifested by its leadership at the Hague Congress.

Bakunin's "anti-authoritarian" International, also undemocratic, survived the Hague. Entering the period of decline it passed under the authority of Kropotkin and Malatesta (1881). Marx's General Council lingered a mere spectre haunting neither Europe nor America. The ghost was buried quietly and none too decently in Philadelphia on the 15 of July 1876.

In 1890 Engels in an introduction to a new edition of the *Communist Manifesto* spoke of "the International Working Men's Association of glorious memory." The revolutionary workers after they learn the truth will remember the so-called International Working Men's Association as well as its descendants, the Second International, the Comintern and Trotsky's Fourth International as organizations of burocratic corruption.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER III.

MARX'S LEFT-BOURGEOIS, GERMAN-NATIONALIST POLICY IN THE REVOLUTION OF 1848

1. *The Communist League*

MARX AND ENGELS began their political career as bourgeois democrats (1841-1847). After a profound study they recognized that society was splitting more and more into bourgeois owners of industry and proletarian wage slaves. They worked out their theoretical conclusion that the struggle between the two classes would not go on indefinitely but would eventually lead, due to the growing contradictions inherent in the capitalist system itself, to the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the eventual disappearance of class divisions in society.

Having grasped the historical importance and role of the working class Marx and Engels turned their attention to the organized proletarian movement which was in ideological darkness.

The year 1847 was a turning point for Marx and Engels. They were leading participants in the European bourgeois democratic movement and at the same time had carried on a campaign of scientific criticism of the League of the Just, organized in 1836, composed largely of German emigre artisans in Zurich, Paris and London. Under the influence of this criticism the League decided to reorganize itself. In January 1847 a delegation was sent to Brussels to invite Marx and Engels to join the League. "What we previously objected to in this League was now relinquished as erroneous by the representatives of the League themselves; we ourselves were invited to contribute to the reorganization. Could we say no? Certainly not. Therefore, we entered the League; Marx founded a local section of the League in Brussels from among our close friends, while I visited the three sections in Paris." (Engels, "History of the Communist League," Karl Marx, *S. W.* II, 15)

Marx and Engels transformed the League of the Just into the Communist League (First Congress, June 1847). Instead of the old class-collaborationist motto, "All men are brothers," the League adopted the class differentiation slogan "Proletarians of all countries, unite."

While Marx and Engels became established as the acknowledged leaders of this organization, they continued as leaders of a bourgeois democratic movement and continued calling themselves "democrats," not Communists. This is seen from a letter Engels wrote to Juttrand, President of the Democratic Association on September 30, 1847: "Sir: Being obliged to leave Brussels for several months, I find myself unable to perform the duties which the meeting of the 27th was good enough to entrust to me. May I request you therefore to call upon a German democrat living in Brussels . . . I am speaking of M. Marx who in my sincere opinion has the best right to represent German democracy

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

on this committee." (Cited by W. Haenisch in *Science and Society* II, 1937, 86). Marx was one of the founders and an eminent member of the Democratic Association and vice-president of the Democratic Association for the Unification of all Countries.

In the Autumn of 1847 Marx went to London to perform a dual function. He was to attend the Second Congress of the Communist League as a Communist and he was also to act as the official representative of the Democratic Association at the conference of the Fraternal Democrats as a bourgeois democrat. This conference preceded the Congress of the Communist League. Marx addressed the Fraternal Democrats and proposed that they form an Alliance with his Democratic Association. The Fraternal Democrats responded with enthusiasm and drafted a reply to the Democratic Association in which they stated: "Your representative, our friend and brother Marx, will tell you with what enthusiasm we welcomed his appearance and the reading of your address. All eyes shone with joy, all voices shouted a welcome and all hands stretched fraternally to your representative... We accept with the liveliest feelings of satisfaction the alliance you have offered us. Our association has existed now for over two years with the motto: all men are brothers." (Cited by Mehring, 168)

Having finished with his task at the conference of the Fraternal Democrats, Marx next day in the same hall attended the Second Congress of the Communist League. Thus in two days he supported two opposite concepts, the bourgeois-democratic, *All men are brothers,* and the proletarian, *Workers of all countries, unite!*

At the Second Congress of the Communist League (November-December 1847) Marx and Engels were commissioned to draft a program containing the basic views and aims of the organization. This program was to replace the old one called "Confession of faith," a purely utopian concotion.

The manner in which Engels had secured support in the Paris branch to become a member of the drafting commission is not without interest. The spirit of the Communist League was proletarian-democratic, with the rank-and-file units, called "communes," having the full right to pass judgment on the basic program. "In accordance with the democratic character of the League . . . the new statutes were first of all placed before individual communes for discussion, the final decision being left to a second congress." (166). Some months before the Congress various programmatic drafts had been produced by a few members, none of which meeting the standards of Marx and Engels. One of the drafts came from Moses Hess, an influential leader. On October 25, 1847 Engels informed Marx he had used subterfuge and burocratic trickery behind the back of the workers to get himself chosen for drafting the program: *"Quite between ourselves* I have played a devilish trick on Mosi (Moses Hess). He had actually put through the most absurd revised confession of faith. Last Friday I went through this in the circle, question by question, and before I

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

had got halfway people announced that they were satisfied. *Without any opposition* I got myself commissioned to draft a new one, which will now be discussed in the circle next Friday, and *behind the backs of the Communes,* sent to London. But of course not a soul must notice this or we shall all be deposed and there will be a deadly row." *(Sel. Cor.* 21)

However, when he had no need for resorting to ruses and maneuvers, Engels was satisfied with a simple burocratic blind to fool the Communist League workers, as a Bolshevik writer records:

"Elections to the congress in London took place in the Paris organization on November 14, 1847. Engels wrote about it in a letter of 15 of November: 'Yesterday the elections of representatives took place. After a very disorderly meeting I was elected by two thirds of the votes. This time I did not resort to intrigues at all, because there were very few occasions for that. The opposition was very weak. Only for a show a worker was put forth as a candidate, but those who put him up voted for me." (V. Adoratsky, "On the Question of the Origin of the Manifesto," *Molodaia Gvardia,* June 1922, 79)

Clearly, no sooner did Marx and Engels enter the proletarian organization then their personal, private-property feeling toward the organization began to assert itself.

2. *A Few Facts Regarding the Communist Manifesto*

The programmatic document which Marx and Engels drafted for the Communist League was originally entitled *The Manifesto of the Communist Party,* and is universally known as the *Communist Manifesto.* The claim that all the ideas expounded in the document originated with its authors is disputed in certain quarters. An open charge is made that Marx and Engels incorporated some of the criticism of the capitalist system made by Victor Considerant in his work *Principles du Socialisme, Manifeste de la Democratie* produced five years before the *Communist Manifesto.*

In 1900 in the journal *Les Temps Nouveaux* an Anarchist writer, Cherkazov, compared the texts of the two documents to show that the *Communist Manifesto* by Marx and Engels was in some respects similar to the *Manifesto* by Considerant. Two years later, in 1902, Professor Charles Andler analyzed the origin of the *Communist Manifesto* and tried to prove that running through this work were ideas known as far back as 1830. On March 24, 1902, the Italian Socialist paper, *Avanti,* carried an article signed A. L. in which the author declared that to the explanation of the expansion of capitalist economy given by Considerant, "Marx did not add a single word." Riazanov in his Notes to the *Communist Manifesto* contemptuously dismisses "Considerant, whom some Anarchists wish to transform into the teacher of Marx and Engels." (R. 256). A rightist Socialist biographer of Marx, John Spargo, defends the authors of the *Communist Manifesto*

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

and declares that the Anarchist story is sheer nonsense: yet he acknowledges that "some passages" in the two documents appear much alike: "There are some passages in this 'Manifesto of the Democracy of the Nineteenth Century' which bear some resemblance to and may even have suggested, certain passages in the work of Marx and Engels." *(Karl Marx,* 128)

Naturally, Marx and Engels are not guilty of any offense if they incorporated into the *Manifesto* certain ideas formed by other thinkers. However, direct citations taken from others must be acknowledged. And Engels, for example, never admitted that he lifted some passages from E. Buret's *De la Misere des classes laborienses en Angleterre et en France* to insert them in his own work *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844.* Further, the Social Democrats and Bolsheviks have been deceiving the workers with the story that the maxim "From everyone according to his faculties, to everyone according to his needs" was coined by Marx *(The Gotha Program).* Research reveals that it was originated by Albee Morelly: "Each is to labor according to his ability and share according to his needs." (Cited by Hertzen in *The History of Utopian Thought,* 187). The maxim was first used by Babouvists and taken over by Cabet's Icarians many decades before Marx wrote his criticism of the *Gotha Program.* (Malon, *Histoire du Socialisme,* II, 165)

Marx gave no due credit to Morelly for the motto, nor to Considerant for throwing valuable light on capitalist development. The *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* contains a few grudging words of recognition of Considerant's correct ideas: "Considerant draws a vivid picture of the process of concentration of production, ruin of small proprietors and the domination of 'the class of capitalists, owners of machines and instruments of production over the class of the dispossessed' and the rise of revolutionary sentiments." (XXXIV, 49). Another Bolshevik reference to Considerant reads: "There is no doubt that for the first chapter of the *Communist Manifesto* certain corresponding places in Considerant could serve as a pattern." (B. Gorev, *Pechat i Revolutsia,* 1921, II, 116)

However, even though Marx and Engels inserted in the *Communist Manifesto* some ideas originated by others, their own theoretical conclusions constituted a signal advance over all the concepts of their predecessors who had presented only a hazy and fragmentary understanding of Capitalism and utterly utopian "solutions" of its contradictions.

The document falls into two basic divisions: 1) the well-integrated general scientific view of history and specifically of bourgeois society; 2) the policy and tactics for the proletariat in the class struggle. The latter did not provide the proletariat with an independent line of action and therefore was one of several negative features of the document. In order to show why the negative features appeared we

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

= Mozilla/5.0
HTTP_ACCEPT-

shall indicate some of the faulty views harbored by Marx and Engels at the time they wrote the document.

The partly confused state of mind of the authors of the *Manifesto* can be observed in the position Engels adopted toward the War between Mexico and the United States (1846-1848). The war was a move by the Southern aristocracy to extend chattel slavery. Northern and Western Congressmen condemned the War. Joshua R. Giddings, a Congressman from Ohio, described the affair as "a war against an unoffending people, without adequate or just cause, for the purpose of conquest, with the design of extending slavery." (Cited in *The Rise of American Civilization* by Beard, I, 606)

Almost two decades before the War, Mexico, though less advanced economically than the United States, had already abolished chattel slavery (Proclamation of President Guerrero, 1829). In the United States chattel slavery was an obstacle to Northern Capitalism which was a progressive *form* of economy by comparison. The war on the part of the United States was reactionary in both senses, political and economic, and militarily aggressive, as shown in the Sumner's Report to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, House Bill #187, April, 1847: "It was the army of the United States that played the part of invaders." (Charles Sumner, Report on the War with Mexico, April 1847, 12). "A war of conquest is bad; but the present war has darker shadows. It is a war for the extension of slavery over a territory which has already been purged, by Mexican authority, of this stain." (15). "It is a war against the Free States of the Union. Conquest and robbery are attempted in order to obtain a political control at home." (17-18)

Yet Engels, already a leader of the Communist League, backed President Polk and the slave power: "The North Americans have not yet concluded the war against the Mexicans. Let us hope that they will get a large part of Mexico and dispose of that country in a better manner than was done by the Mexicans." *(Kommunistische Zeitschrift,* September 1847; printed in the Riazanov edition of the *Communist Manifesto,* R. 303)

Regarding the nature of the Mexican war, the Stalin burocrats wrote: "Lincoln while a Congressman opposed the unjust, annexationist Mexican War and demanded its termination." (Statement by William Z. Foster and Eugene Dennis, Cited in *N. Y. T.* March 3, 1949). But they withheld from the workers Engels' and Marx's position of support to that War. In this respect they merely followed the example of Lenin and German Social Democracy in the War of 1914. Lenin then invoked Marx and Engels as authorities on what is a progressive, what is a reactionary war, and dishonestly distorted Engels' 1890 position of support to Wilhelm II, but he was cautious not to mention the stand Engels and Marx assumed in the Mexican War. The Social Democrats, while imparting a correct interpretation to Engels' line of backing the German Empire, kept quiet in an equally dishonest manner about the Mexican War. Had the out-and-out reac-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
ACCEPT-

tionary stand of Marx and Engels been revealed, the workers would have hardly considered them as authorities on the war question and would have been on guard against accepting all the ideas in the *Communist Manifesto.*

In January 1848, when the military victory of the American slave power was complete, Marx and Engels, having just concluded drafting the *Communist Manifesto,* greeted the triumph of the Southern aristocracy with an outburst of joy:

"In America before our eyes there has taken place the conquest of Mexico which can be greeted only with joy. If a country till then occupied exclusively with its internal affairs, torn apart by constant civil wars which obstruct every movement forward—a country which at best was destined to become a commercial vassal of England—if such a country is drawn by force into the general historical stream, then in that too it is necessary to recognize progress. In the interests of the development of Mexico itself it is advantageous that in the future she should be under the wardship of the United States." ("Revolutionary Movements in 1847." Cited in the Riazanov edition of the *Communist Manifesto,* R. 40; *Works,* V. R. 246-7)

However, Marx's and Engels' basic 1848 policy was that of attachment to the bourgeois democrats. And it was this fundamental stand that strongly affected their tactical line and introduced an insoluble contradiction into the *Manifesto.* On the one hand, in the theoretical section, its authors set down the principle that the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are irreconcilable; on the other hand in the tactical section, they ignored this principle and assigned to the proletariat the role of an appendage to the bourgeoisie.

The *Manifesto* was understood to be a program for building a revolutionary-proletarian party. How does one go about this task? First, a set of principles is introduced to the workers. One of the principles calls for a complete organizational separation of the revolutionary-proletarian party from all the non-revolutionary or anti-revolutionary labor and petty-bourgeois parties, groups and tendencies. Theoretically the *Manifesto* did draw a sharp line of demarcation between the Communists and the bourgeois Socialists, utopians and reformists. Tactically, however, the political independence of the Communists was precluded: "The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties." *(S. W.* I, 218)

Another very important principle is the dissemination of proletarian-revolutionary ideology among the workers throughout the labor movement and all of society. Theoretically, the *Manifesto* indicated that this was to be the task of the Communists. The tactical line, however, was that the Communists would refrain from uprooting the anti-proletarian ideology within the working class: "They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own, by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement." *(Ib.)*

Theoretically, the avowed goal of the Communists was to establish

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
ACCEPT-

the independence of the proletariat and the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, while the aim of all the other parties was to preserve the bourgeois society. Yet in the programmatic message of the *Manifesto* all the bourgeois labor parties were portrayed as pursuing the same goal as the Communists and, moreover, seeking to achieve it immediately: "The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: Formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat." (219)

In fine, the tactical positions of the *Communist Manifesto* were at odds with its theoretical pattern; they represent Rightist pitfalls for the proletariat. It is precisely this tactical pattern which Stalin and Trotsky employed in betraying the Chinese Revolution and which Stalin, Social Democracy, Anarchism, the POUM and Trotsky applied in betraying the Spanish Revolution.

With respect to Germany the *Manifesto* advanced even an ultra-Right line of support to the German bourgeoisie which was falsely pictured as occasionally "acting in a revolutionary way" both against absolutism and the petty bourgeoisie. "In France the Communists ally themselves with the Social-Democrats, against the conservative and radical bourgeoisie . . . In Switzerland they support the Radicals, without losing sight of the fact that this party consists of antagonistic elements, partly of Democratic Socialists, in the French sense, partly of radical bourgeois . . . In Germany they fight with the bourgeoisie whenever it acts in a revolutionary way, against the absolute monarchy, the feudal squirearchy, and the petty bourgeoisie . . . Finally, they labour everywhere for the union and agreement of the democratic parties of all countries." (240, 241)

Thus the tactical line of the *Manifesto* attached the proletariat to the bourgeois State.

The organization of production and the concentration of funds was to be placed not in the hands of a world proletarian economic organization but in the hands of a *national* State bank: "Centralization of credit in the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and exclusive monopoly." (228)

This very concept of *national* proletarian revolution occurs in Lenin's April Theses: "Immediate merger of all the banks in the country into one general national bank."

The idea of a national Workers State contained in the *Manifesto* becomes even more apparent and pronounced when Marx and Engels discuss the higher stage of historical development, the period when society assumes a classless character and the State is in the process of withering away: "When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character."

The central false feature in the above is represented by the words

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
ACCEPT-

"the whole nation" in which, supposedly, class distinctions and the State, or "public power," would be at a vanishing point—a stage synonymous with the arrival of Socialism. Such a development can take place not on a national but only on a *world* scale. Thus, the central and "highest" purpose in the *Manifesto* is a national Proletarian State.

3. *Marx and Engels in Paris During the Revolution of 1848*

On February 24, 1848 the proletariat of Paris overthrew the July Monarchy. As in Russia in February-March 1917, the bourgeoisie immediately plotted to place another king on the throne, but under the threat of the workers the bourgeois Chamber formed a provisional government. At the same time the petty-bourgeois Republicans set up at the Hotel de Ville a "dual power" which included the bourgeois democrats Louis Blanc, Flocon and others. After a few hours of negotiations the petty-bourgeois "government" capitulated and entered as a minority into the bourgeois Provisional Government. Two days later, on February 27, Marx in Brussels, as a leader of the Democratic Association, collaborated in drafting a message of greetings from this petty-bourgeois body to the new bourgeois government of France (Nic. and M-H. 143). The French bourgeoisie through its Government addressed an official communication to Marx:

"The Provisional Government, French Republic: Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. The French Republic is a place of refuge for all friends of freedom. Tyranny has banished you. France opens its gates to you, to you and to all those who fight for the sacred cause, for the fraternal cause of all peoples. Every officer of the French government must understand his mission in this spirit. Greetings and Fraternity! Ferdinand Flocon, Member of the Provisional Government." (Cited by Perchik, *Karl Marx*, 27)

Upon receipt of this invitation Marx departed for France and arrived in Paris on March 4, a week after the establishment of the Republic. The fascinating illusions disseminated by the petty-bourgeois leaders were rife among the Paris workers. A true proletarian revolutionary leader would have plunged at once into the work of exposing the Louis Blancs, Ledru-Rollins, Flocons and other extremely dangerous confusers who chained the proletariat to the bourgeois State, and would have assisted the proletariat to achieve political and organizational independence in a struggle for real liberation. Not so with Marx. His relations with the Kerenskys and Chernovs of that period were most cordial: "Marx's relations with the groups which were represented in the Provisional Government by Ledru-Rollin and Flocon were particularly good. Both these ministers were praised in the letters Engels wrote his brother-in-law, Emil Blank. Engels said the workers would hear of no one but Ledru Rollin, and they were

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

quite right, because he was more resolute than any of the others." (N. and M-H. 152)

During his stay in Paris Marx did not participate in the proletarian class struggle in France. He left the French workers to their misleaders, and concentrated his attention on his native land, Germany, where the revolutionary situation was maturing.

The Central Committee of the Communist League was transferred from London to Paris and reorganized, with Marx receiving full powers of leadership as the president. Marx then drafted a seventeen-point plaftorm, "Demands of the Communist Party in Germany," which was of a purely national bourgeois-democratic character.

On March 13 the masses of Vienna rose in insurrection and overthrew the Metternich regime. Five days later Berlin was aflame with revolution. Early in April Marx and Engels crossed the frontier into Germany.

4. *Marx and Engels versus the Revolutionary Tasks of the Proletariat*

An indispensable feature for the success of the proletarian revolution is that the workers gain awareness of their own enormous social weight. In 1848 the German workers possessed this essential understanding, as Marx wrote more than three years after the revolution: "The very working classes which it had been the tendency of the bourgeoisie to keep in the background, had been pushed forward, had fought and conquered, and all at once were conscious of their strength." *(S. W.* II, 77)

In the rising class conflict, the German workers were in desperate need of a political organization to guide them. It was necessary for the proletarian vanguard, therefore, to engage its energies in building the proletarian-revolutionary party. Indubitably, the only existing nucleus for the Party was the Communist League. It is clear, then, what line Marx and the League should have taken. In March 1850, by way of drawing up the balance sheet of the Revolution of 1848, Marx declared in an Address of the Central Council of the Communist League that "the workers, and above all the League, must strive to establish an independent, secret and open, organization of the Workers' Party alongside the official democrats and make each local section the central point and nucleus of workers' association in which the attitude and interests of the proletariat will be discussed independently of bourgeois influences." (162)

We observe that, after the Revolution, in 1850, Marx unfolded apparently a correct policy for the Communist League and the proletariat. However, in the Revolution of 1848, when all of Central and Western Europe was aflame with proletarian struggle, Marx carried out an altogether different policy. Upon his arrival in Germany he plunged into the work of establishing not a proletarian

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

but a petty-bourgeois party: "In the middle of April Marx and his friends participated in the formation of the Democratic Union in Cologne. It did not at first stand out in any particular way, but took the line that the form of government of the future united Germany should be left to be decided by the National Assembly at Frankfurt and that the relations between throne and people in Prussia should be left to the Chamber in Berlin." (Nic. M-H. 162)

Thus, the official position of the Democratic Union was that of timidity even with respect to such an elementary bourgeois-democratic task as the establishment of a capitalist republic. Unofficially, the majority of the Democrats were "republicans," but none of them dared to go on record officially for a republic: "This evasion of a clear answer to the most elementary questions left the members of the Democratic Union more than dissatisfied. Someone at the meeting asked what the members of the Democratic Union wanted themselves. Seven-eights of them were in favor of a republic, as the discussion showed, but no resolution in favor of a republic was made. The few who had not yet made up their minds should not be antagonized and driven over to the moderates." *(Ib.)*

The Stalinist editor of Marx's works says in a footnote to Engels' article "Marx and the Neue Rheinische Zeitung": "Marx and Engels supported the extreme Democratic Party only in so far as it still played a revolutionary role and they never forgot for a moment to emphasize and to defend the *special tasks* of the proletariat in the revolution." *(S. W.* II, 28). We have witnessed how "extreme" was the Democratic group which Marx not only supported but helped to organize. We shall determine whether the assertion that Marx and Engels defended the special tasks of the proletariat in the Revolution is true.

5. *Marx Suppresses His Communist Manifesto*

One of the basic tasks of proletarian revolutionists, *at all times,* is to strive to organize the leading section of the working class into a political party and to launch a proletarian organ to enlighten and furnish guidance to the masses. Marx did not carry out the first part of this task, nor the second.

Before we describe the organ which Marx founded and edited during the Revolution of 1848, it is necessary to examine his position on the immediate political role of the German workers who, as he later wrote, "had been pushed forward, had fought and conquered, and all at once were conscious of their strength." (77). Engels indicated this position: "The great mass of the proletariat, still unacquainted with its own historical role, had first of all to take on the role of the forward-pressing, extreme Left wing of the bourgeoisie." (30-31)

Marx and Engels never explained why the proletariat *had* to play the role of a Left tail to the bourgeoisie. In accord with this

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

view, instead of launching a *proletarian* organ to *acquaint the proletariat with its own role,* Marx and Engels founded a Left bourgeois paper. Starting with the premise that the role of the proletariat must be that of a Left wing of the bourgeoisie, Marx and Engels themselves assumed this role. In appealing to the Liberal capitalists for funds to establish the paper, Marx and Engels concealed their Communist facet and presented their Left bourgeois democratic facet: "It was difficult to raise money for the project, since many of the capitalists to whom they appealed knew something of their social ideas and intentions. Marx collected subscriptions in Cologne, and Engels in the Wuppertal. Thence he wrote to his friends: 'If a single copy of our Seventeen Points gets into this district, our cause is lost. The outlook of the bourgeoisie is really contemptible.' " (Mayers, 94-95)

Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and other Bolsheviks as well as the Social Democrats and pink Liberals exercise great caution and restraint in dealing with the 1848 phase of Marx's political activity. Commenting on the conditions to which Marx agreed in accepting the position of editor, the strong admirers of Marx, Nicolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen, give Engels' testimony to the effect that one of the conditions was to leave the question of monarchy or republic open. They write: "Marx succeeded in gaining control of the paper within a very short time. For this purpose it was necessary to secure the consent of the Cologne Democrats. The newspaper had to be 'edited from the German Democratic viewpoint, which regarded the question of whether Germany should have a monarchy or a republic as an open one, though it gave the advantage to the republican idea both from the practical and the theoretical point of view.' This was how Burgers formulated the conditions on which the editorship would be given to Marx. Burgers was himself on the editorial board. Marx naturally accepted these terms." (165)

The length to which Marx "naturally" went in attaching himself and the workers to the Left bourgeoisie can be measured by the fact that the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* the paper he edited, did not even mention the *Communist Manifesto* or, for that matter, the Communist League. Mehring writes: "Lassalle never mentioned either the Communist League or its Manifesto in his agitation, and it is just as true that in the several hundred numbers of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* there is just as little reference to either of them." (337)

Was the suppression of the *Communist Manifesto* by its own authors during the 1848 Revolution due to some governmental restraint on the freedom of the press? Not at all! Engels recorded quite definitely that "on the Rhine we had unconditional freedom of the press—and we used it to the last drop." *(S. W.* II, 32). How little "to the last drop" Marx and Engels utilized the *unconditional* freedom of the press can be further seen from the fact that even the bourgeois-democratic "Seventeen Points" which they had drawn up

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in Paris during the Revolution were not made public by them in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung!* Supposedly, Marx and Engels were completely imbued with the ideology of the *Communist Manifesto,* which they had published only two months before the outbreak of the Revolution. In that document they appeared to have given a courageous example of being outspoken. At that time, with no freedom of the press on the Continent, they issued a definite motto: "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims." But when they received *unconditional* freedom of the press they hid the *Communist Manifesto* from the proletariat, and hid it very effectively. The record of omission in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* is so glaring that the deifiers of Marx, Nicolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen, felt they could not ignore it: "The paper's policy was determined by Marx and Marx alone. Marx edited it as he had edited the *Rheinische Zeitung* five years before. Just as behind every word of the *Rheinische Zeitung* there had been the voice of Marx, so did he now make every word of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* his own. The paper called itself the 'organ of democracy' and in speaking of the battle-front against the forces of feudal absolutism it used the phrase 'we Democrats.' During the first months it avoided anything that might possibly disturb the united front. Not a word was spoken of the antagonism between proletarian and non-proletarian, bourgeois or petty-bourgeois democracy. There was not a word about the special interests of the working classes, of the workers' special tasks in the German Revolution." (167)

With unfailing ardour Marx and Engels acted as practicing pedagogues of the Left bourgeois democrats, decrying the cowardice of the Democratic Party which in essence was a shamefaced Left monarchist organization. "We demand of the Democratic Party that it become conscious of its situation." wrote Marx in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (VI R. 118). Futilely striving to stimulate a revolutionary spirit in this narrowminded lot, Marx simultaneously identified himself with it. "For us, democrats" he wrote in the paper on June 5, 1848 (147) and continued to the end of its publication presenting himself as a Left bourgeois democrat. His utterly false assumption was that the democrats would remove the bourgeois-monarchist power and would set up their own regime. What these extreme bourgeois Lefts represented Marx showed in his paper on the twelfth day of its publication: "At the extreme Left we distinguish a colorful mixture of most heterogeneous elements." (VI, R. 129). Engels later wrote that only when this political Left-bourgeois mixture attained power would he and Marx form an opposition to it: "We openly proclaimed that the tendency we represented could only enter the struggle for the attainment of our real party aims if the most extreme of the official parties existing in Germany came to the helm; then we would form the opposition to it." (*S. W.* II, 35)

The truth is that Marx and Engels in the Revolution of 1848 never "openly proclaimed" anything of the sort. They openly arrayed

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

themselves on the side of the Left Liberals. This policy did irreparable injury to the proletariat. The Left Liberals attached themselves to the big bourgeoisie, and the big bourgeoisie wanted nothing less than an absolutist monarchial regime.

On the eve of the Revolution, Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* had given a clear and precise expression to the attitude the Communists were to assume towards the question of enlightening the proletariat: "But they never cease, for a single instant, to instill into the working class the clearest possible recognition of the hostile antagonism between bourgeoisie and proletariat, in order that the German workers may straightway use, as so many weapons against the bourgeoisie, the social and political conditions that the bourgeoisie must necessarily introduce along with its supremacy, and in order that, after the fall of the reactionary classes in Germany, the fight against the bourgeoisie itself may immediately begin." *(S. W.* I, 241).

Yet in the Revolution of 1848 the line of enlightening the workers in the science of the class struggle with its Socialist goal was *consciously* avoided by Marx and Engels.

In harmony with burocratic principles, notable from their very entry into the camp of the working class, Marx and Engels, while clamoring for democracy on every page of their paper, established in its editorial room a *one-man dictatorship,* as testified to by Engels himself: "The editorial constitution was simply the dictatorship of Marx. A big daily paper, which has to be ready at a definite hour and which wishes to put forward definite views, cannot observe a consistent policy with any other constitution." (II, 32)

A revolutionary-proletarian paper, big or small, must be operated *democratically,* subject to the directives of the majority of the editorial staff whose views it promulgates and submitted for general approval of policy to the proletarian vanguard. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* "The most famous German newspaper of the year of the revolution" (Engels), was not a revolutionary-proletarian paper, not even a reformist labor paper, but an "Organ of Democracy," as its masthead loudly announced, a Left bourgeois German-nationalist paper operated under a one-man dictatorship.

None of the idolators of Marx have been able to cite a single passage from the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* in which its editor unequivocally identified himself with the German proletariat as his class. And even when, in June 1848, the class struggle in France reached the stage of proletarian insurrection against the bourgeois Republic, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* would not clearly identify itself with the working class. The paper voiced warm sympathy for the butchered Parisian workers but Marx and his assistants on the editorial staff demarcated themselves from the proletariat as *democrats.*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

6. *The Proletarian Mass Movement in Germany*

A few years before the *Manifesto* the heavily exploited working class of Germany had evinced signs of open rebellion directly against the bourgeoisie. In his work *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution,* Marx wrote: "In 1845, there occurred the Silesian weavers' riots, followed by the insurrection of the calico printers in Prague. These riots, cruelly suppressed, riots of working men, not against the government but against their employers, created a deep sensation, and gave a new stimulus to socialist and communist propaganda amongst the working people. So did the bread riots during the year of famine, 1847." *(S. W.* II, 60)

In 1848 after the first explosion against the monarchy the proletarian ferment burst upon the bourgeoisie in every important city of Germany. The workers, as soon as they felt their strength, were eager to pit it against the tyranny of wage slavery. The instinctive yearning for liberation found expression in a sweeping movement into trade unions, cooperatives and various labor associations. By far the largest of these was the Workers Brotherhood founded by a member of the Communist League, Stephan Born. "Insofar as the proletarian movement was independent it was a purely economic movement, and all organizations created by the German proletariat in the course of the revolution, which went beyond the local limits, were purely economic —artisan or cooperative—organizations. The most significant of these was 'Workers Brotherhood' (Arbeiterverbruderung) which had sections over the entire country. At the head of this 'Brotherhood' stood the compositor Stephan Born, a talented young fellow who, prior to the revolution, was active in Brussels and Paris under the leadership of Marx and Engels in the capacity of an active member of the Communist League." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XV, 806). Working in the very thick of the aroused proletariat Born was carried away by revolutionary enthusiasm as he saw his efforts to organize the workers highly successful. In an enthusiastic letter to Marx he wrote from Berlin: "The proletariat is revolutionary through and through. Everywhere I am organizing its dispersed forces into a concentrated strength." (Cited by Ruhle, 163)

Another workers' organization of considerable weight was founded by Doctor Andreas Gottschalk, a leader of the Cologne branch of the Communist League. While Marx, upon arriving in Cologne, devoted his energies to organizing the bourgeois democrats, Gottschalk was occupied with the task of welding together the forces of the proletariat. "Three hundred people were present at the inaugural meeting on April 13. The overwhelming majority were workers. For this reason they promptly adopted the additional title of 'Workers Union.' The success of the new organization was astonishing. At the beginning of May the newspapers estimated its membership at between three and four thousand. By the end of June the membership had

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

risen to nearly eight thousand. Every one of its meetings at the Gurzenich-haus was packed to overflowing. The workers in their blouses sat before a platform adorned with the red flag, wearing red sashes across their breasts, some of them with red Jacobin caps on their heads. Many of the audience were women, and many were illiterate workers, porters and boatmen, who were particularly hard hit by the prevailing unemployment." (N. and M-H. 158). Naturally, this powerful proletarian organization which soon numbered eight thousand members in a city of only about a hundred thousand inhabitants frightened the bourgeoisie: "Not only the employers but the whole propertied class regarded the Workers' Union as a nefarious assault upon humanity. The most incredible rumours gathered round the Union and its president, Gottschalk, 'the Communist apostle.'" (159)

However, the Workers Union was at best an auxiliary class instrument. The flame of proletarian revolution could be kindled only by a *political* instrument, a *party*. Much, therefore, depended upon the leading theoreticians of the epoch, Marx and Engels.

7. *Marx Breaks up the Communist League*

Marx was present at the meetings called by Gottschalk: "He took part in the first meetings of the Workers Union. But in a very short time differences of opinion concerning the policy of the Union arose between Gottschalk and him. A contemporary record had survived of a meeting which took place shortly after Marx's arrival between the leaders of the Communist League on the one side and the members of the Cologne branch on the other. The discussion is said to have become 'very violent' and Dr. Gottschalk was harshly criticized in regard to the organization of the Workers Union." (159-160)

As we remember, during Marx's sojourn in Brussels and Paris and on visits to London, his policy was to have a foot in different class camps. This double position could not be maintained in 1848 when the relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie were in a state of high tension. At the outset he was faced with a history-making decision. On the Right were the Democrats anchored to the bourgeois State; on the Left was first of all the Communist League, and next, Gottschalk, who was groping in theoretical darkness to break away from the bourgeois State. Marx chose to stay with the bourgeois Democrats. This choice necessitated the termination of the dual character of his politics and the abandonment of participation in the proletarian movement. Proceeding from this premise Marx decided to dissolve the Communist League. When he met opposition from his Communist followers, he acted as though the organization were his private property and liquidated it burocratically: "Schapper and the other members of the London group put up some opposition to this course. Though they agreed with him on general political ques-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tions and sided with him in the struggle with Gottschalk, they had lived in the League and with the League and for the League and it had been dear to them too long for them to be able to consent to its dissolution. So Marx, in the words of a contemporary, 'made use of his discretionary powers and dissolved the League.' " (163-4). This high-handed action of Marx was defied by the sections of the Communist League abroad but was acceded to by the German branches. Curiously, Gottschalk agreed to the dissolution of the League because he saw in this a method of severing all organizational connections with Marx who was hindering his work. By this ultra-Left attitude Gottschalk quite inadvertently played into the hands of Marx and the bourgeoisie.

Today every enlightened worker recognizes that without a revolutionary party the proletariat cannot achieve Socialism. The obfuscators of history impute that this was a basic principle with Marx and Engels. The truth is that Marx and Engels held very lightly to this principle both in the initial and the closing stages of their political activity. In 1885 Engels introduced this fantastic anarchist notion: "Today the German proletariat does not need any official organization any longer, either public or secret; the simple self-evident interconnection of like-minded class comrades suffices, without any statutes, committees, resolutions or other tangible forms, to shake the whole German empire to its foundation." *(S. W.* II, 26)

The dissolution of the League and the suppression of the *Communist Manifesto* by Marx himself must have astounded the bourgeoisie. In the *Manifesto* Marx had said: "A spectre is haunting Europe—the spectre of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies." But the bourgeoisie certainly had never anticipated that Marx too would be exorcising the spectre of Communism.

On April 5, 1848, while in Paris, five days before he departed for Germany, Marx and Engels had written to Cabet: " 'We don't doubt for a moment that we shall soon be able to give you favorable news on the march of the Communist movement in Germany.' " (Cited in *Science and Society,* Spring 1940, 217). Knifed by Marx, the Communist movement during the Revolutionary years of 1848-9 was on the march to its grave.

Following the liquidation of the Communist League Gottschalk was imprisoned on false charges of inciting the workers to violence. Marx's supporters, Moll and Schapper, the only remaining leading Communists in the Workers' Union, took control. They soon helped Marx to attach this proletarian organization to the bourgeoisie by uniting with the Democrats and the expressly class-collaborationist Association of Employers and Employed. To further illustrate Marx's and Engels' complete separation from the class interests of the proletariat in the Revolution of 1848 we shall cite an article written by

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Engels in September 1847, only six months before the workers rose in Europe and before Marx and he returned to Germany. In that article Engels did not appear as a bourgeois democrat but as a proletarian revolutionist:

"Look what fear we already instill now in the King's regime 'by the grace of God' and in the bougreoisie! And this is so at present when we are still deprived of almost any cohesion when we are still individuals, often engaged in a struggle and bloody fights among ourselves like people who do not know the greatness and the strength of unity! Let us recall how, during the bread riots, several hundred Berlin proletarians who came out without any plan, any mutual agreement, without a common goal, brought shivers to the entire capital and frightened the high powers out of their wits for half a day. Two highest officials of the Cabinet themselves admitted that 'despite a great number of troops, Berlin could have fallen into the hands of the workers had they been capable at least to some degree of utilizing their strength and had they acted according to a common plan.' Berlin factually for five hours was in the hands of the people who themselves did not realize this fact. Similar events occurred in many other regions of Prussia and the rest of Germany. If little isolated groups of proletarians, acting without a plan and agreement, could cause such a danger to the existing social structure, then is it not clear that no power can prevent our victory if we come out organized and united as one man. As *individuals* we are and always will be helpless slaves in the power of want and poverty and dependent on the brutal will or grace of the rich and the eminent. *Organized* and *united* we will be able without an effort, as one breaks a dry rod, to smash the chains put on us by private property and the 'Christian-German' government." *(Kommunistische Leitschrift,* Sept. 1847; V. R. 569-570)

The position Engels, naturally in agreement with Marx, took in this article was in spirit and ideas proletarian-revolutionary. But when the workers' unrest, constantly growing, reached the stage of general insurrection, when the masses, inspired by their initial successes, might have been liberated from the chains of bourgeois private property, Marx arrived in Germany and "as one breaks a dry rod" smashed not the bourgeois economic chains but the only existing proletarian-political organization capable, if equipped with a correct line, of creating a political class differentiation between the workers and the capitalists. And in its place Marx began to construct a bourgeois organization. True, the Communist League, by the virtue of the fact that it was a burocratically-controlled and a fundamentally German organization could never have led the world masses toward emancipation. However, since it was only several months old and Marx's power was far less centralized than Lenin's was in the Bolshevik Party, a proletarian-democratic danger to Marx might have arisen. At any rate, the development of the Revolution along class-cleavage between the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

proletariat and the bourgeoisie, as in Russia in 1917, could have prevented the return of royal absolutism. But just as Lenin abandoned all his pre-October proletarian-revolutionary pledges, so did Marx and Engels at the time when the proletariat of the most advanced countries on the Continent, France and Germany, threatened the power of the monarchies and their mainstay the bourgeoisie, without a word cast overboard the line expressed in the above-cited article.

Due to Marx's policy of establishing complete political dependence of the proletariat on the bourgeoisie the restoration of the absolutist power in Germany and of a strong Rightist sweep in France and in other countries on the Continent was a foregone conclusion. In Germany in the Autumn of 1848 the situation was as follows: on the Right, the monarchist regime, though profoundly shaken by the workers' rising in March 1848, was by degrees regaining its prerogatives; solidly united with it was the bourgeoisie; clinging to the bourgeoisie were the bourgeois democrats, and finally, chained to this hopelessly reactionary procession by Marx and Engels through the Association of Employers and Employed and other anti-working class links, was the proletariat. As a consequence, to the proletariat which began the revolution of 1848, the situation held the promise of nothing but disaster.

8. *Gottschalk's Last Attack on Marx's Bourgeois Position*

While glorifying Marx and Engels, the Social Democratic and Bolshevik leaders have left the memory of Gottschalk in obscurity. The official Stalin historians, when they do mention the man, envenom their diagnosis of his policy and twist the facts to make it appear that it was Marx, not Gottschalk, who fought for the leading class position of the proletariat. Marx, they say, struggled "Against sectarianism and refusal to fight for the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution manifested by Gottschalk." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXXVIII, 211). Actually, Gottschalk was compelled to fight Marx who opposed not only the hegemony but even the independence of the proletariat.

After six months of imprisonment Gottschalk was set free. He found the Workers' Union in a deplorable condition. The majority had been won over by Moll and Schapper to Marx's policy. All that the Gottschalk group retained was the Union paper. Perceiving that the new orientation of the Union meant the workers' undoing, Gottschalk issued a vibrant *class* challenge to Marx: "Gottschalk's paper declared relentless warfare on 'all parties, from that of the *Neue Preussische Zeitung* (the mouthpiece of the extreme Right) to that of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung.*' In the issue of February 25, 1849, there appeared an open letter 'to Herr Karl Marx' which laid plain the substance of the dispute between Gottschalk and him." (N. and M-H. 185)

The immediate cause prompting Gottschalk to issue a class chal-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lenge to Marx was the latter's article in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* of January 21, 1849. In this article Marx still sharper reversed the political direction he had outlined for the proletariat on the eve of the Revolution. Marx had said in the *Manifesto:* "the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution." But in the article of January 21, 1849, when the big rearguard battles against the Monarchist-bourgeois power were still ahead (Spring 1849), Marx completely removed the proletarian revolution from the agenda not "merely" for the immediate situation but for an indefinite period of time. No longer turning the mind of the workers toward a struggle for their class objectives, freedom and the building of a Socialist society, Marx now urged the workers to reconcile themselves to their position as slaves and accept privations and misery under the domination of the capitalists: "We say to the workers and petty-bourgeoisie: rather suffer in modern bourgeois society, which by the development of industry creates the material means for the foundation of a new society which will free you, then step backwards into an obsolete form of society, which, under the pretext of saving your class, will plunge the whole nation back into mediaeval barbarism.'" (VII, R. 162; cited by Nicolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen, 186-7)

In essence Marx's position was identical with the line the Mensheviks pursued in 1917 when the bourgeoisie took power and they, pretending they were for overthrow of Capitalism, insisted that Russia first had to go through a protracted capitalist development before conditions could be ripe for the ousting of the Russian bourgeoisie. Marx showed into whose hands the Revolution of 1848 had placed the power: "The Revolution has overthrown all the powers of the absolute monarchy—the nobility, the burocrats, the military and the priests. It has brought power exclusively to the big bourgeoisie. To the people it has given the weapons of freedom of the press without the requirement of a monetary bond, the right of forming trade unions and at least to a degree also the material weapon—guns." (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* June 14, 1848; VI, R. 165)

However, despite the extremely favorable objective situation for the proletariat, despite the statement in the *Communist Manifesto* that "Society can no longer live under this bourgeoisie, in other words, its existence is no longer compatible with society," Marx told the workers to continue suffering under the bourgeoisie!

To Gottschalk Marx's rejection of the proletarian goal and the acceptance of Capitalism as a *lesser evil* represented the postponement of the liberation of the working class to some misty future: "Gottschalk's reply to Marx was: 'What is the purpose of such a revolution? Why should we, men of the proletariat, spill our blood for this? Must we really plunge voluntarily into the purgatory of a decrepit capitalist domination to avoid a mediaeval hell, as you, sir preacher, proclaim to us, in order to attain from there the nebulous heaven of your

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Communist creed?' " (N. and M-H. 187). The German workers, who were in an unparalleled revolutionary mood, must fight for power—such was Gottschalk's basic political direction in line with the theoretical position outlined by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto.* "He derided Marx for making the outbreak of revolution in Germany dependent on an outbreak in France and an outbreak in France dependent on an outbreak in England. He maintained that the proletariat must carry out its revolution here and now, without hesitations or misgivings. The revolution must be permanent and must continue until the victory of the proletariat. It was obvious that, holding these views as he did, Gottschalk was bound to reject cooperation with the bourgeois Democrats even if they were not (and this was another dig at Marx) such 'weaklings and nobodies' as the Cologne deputies whom Marx had recommended for election." (188)

Marx's answer to Gottschalk was contemptuous silence.

Gottschalk's followers in the Workers Union put up a furious resistance to Marx's policy of binding the organization to the bourgeoisie. The two policies could not be reconciled. The workers struggling for organizational and political independence withdrew and formed their own organization. But circumstances were no longer favorable to the proletariat. By frittering away a whole revolutionary year in eloquent but utterly unrealistic exhortations to the Left bourgeoisie, by creating a political void within the ranks of the proletariat through the destruction of the Communist League, and by tying the Rhineland workers, the most advanced in Germany, to the Association of Employers and Employed, Marx, whose name became prominent in Germany and was becoming known in other countries, demoralized the proletarian vanguard.

With reaction looming black and ominous, the Gottschalk organization, possessing neither scientific clarity nor its former strength, was unable to revive the spirit of class independence among the workers. Gottschalk died a little over six months after his unanswered challenge to Marx.

9. *Marx "Breaks" with the Democrats*

Marx's followers, though bowing to his political leadership, still retained a certain amount of independent thinking. The feeling that the suppression of the *Communist Manifesto* and the destruction of the Communist League augured fatal consequences for the proletariat grew among them. They recognized that there was a crying need to repair the damage occasioned by Marx's disruptive policy. "Gottschalk had expressed, in however distorted and mutilated a fashion, an undercurrent of feeling in the revolutionary movement that grew stronger and stronger as time went on and affected even those who had hitherto followed Marx in his policy of coalition with bourgeois democracy. The same aspiration, to liberate the workers' movement

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

from all burdensome and oppressive ties, called the Communist League into being once more. Its old leaders, with Schapper and Moll at their head, had never been entirely reconciled to the dissolution of the League, although they had not been able to resist Marx's arguments for its dissolution. The branches of the League abroad had never acknowledged its dissolution." (189)

The initiative to reconstitute the League was taken by the members of the Paris and London branches, particularly by Moll who had fled from Germany to London and thus removed himself from Marx's immediate influence. Moll wrote to Schapper in Cologne urging the restoration of the Communist League: "At the beginning of 1849 Schapper was informed by Moll of the London decision and invited to found a branch in Cologne. Schapper summoned the old members of the League and a few of the most active members of the Workers' Union and established a branch. Marx, Engels and the rest of the editorial staff of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* seem to have been invited to join it in vain." *(Ib.)*

Marx reacted to the proposal to rejoin the Communist League with a barbed refusal. Rooted at this time in the soil of the bourgeois State, he fought against the cold truth that the proletariat must be detached from the bourgeoisie. The Communists felt they had to convince the man who as a theoretician still cast his magic spell over them. "A short time afterwards Moll appeared surreptitiously in Cologne as the representative of the new central office. He travelled all over Germany establishing contacts on behalf of the organization. His chief aim was to persuade Marx and Engels to rejoin the League. A meeting took place at the editorial offices of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. Marx, Engels and Wilhelm Wolf were present, besides Moll and members of the Cologne branch. 'The discussion centered on whether the League ought to be reestablished or not,' one of those present at the meeting later wrote. 'Those who took part in the debate were chiefly Marx, Engels and Wolf on the one side and Schapper and Moll on the other. Marx declared once again that under existing conditions, with freedom of speech and freedom of the press, the League was superfluous. Schapper and Moll, on the other hand insisted that the League was absolutely essential." (189-90). Since at the time the meeting took place the rebirth of the League was already an accomplished fact, Marx really fought not over the question of reestablishing the organization but for its dissolution once again.

Many years later Engels wrote *The History of the Communist League*. The work is a falsification of history and a cover up for Marx. Only the pre-1848 period which constituted the constructive part of Marx's and his own activity in the League is described. The fact that Marx disrupted the Communist League at the crucial moment in the great upheaval of the European workers, that he committed the deed burocratically by abusing his prerogatives as president of the body, without consulting the membership and against the protests

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the old founders of the League, was concealed by Engels. Other illuminating and vitally important facts, such as the reconstruction of the League in opposition to Marx and himself, their obstinate refusal to rejoin it, and their vigorous endeavor to kill it again after history had generously supplied them for a whole revolutionary year with ample proof of the unfitness of the Left Democrats for leadership, were suppressed by Engels to immortalize the myth of Marx's and his own infallability.

A few years after the Revolution, in a series of articles published in the *New York Tribune,* eventually compiled under the title *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution,* Marx and Engels told some very strange tales. Leaving in the dark their own unity with the bourgeois Democrats during the Revolution, they stated that the really revolutionary party was the *proletarian* party, in other words, the Communist League. Thus they admitted indirectly that the Democratic party was not revolutionary: "The proletarian, or really revolutionary party, succeeded only very gradually in withdrawing the mass of the working people from the influence of the Democrats, whose tail they formed in the beginning of the revolution. But in due time the indecision, weakness and cowardice of the Democratic leaders did the rest, and it may now be said to be one of the principal results of the last years' convulsions, that wherever the working class is concentrated in anything like considerable masses, they are entirely freed from that democratic influence which led them into an endless series of blunders and misfortunes during 1848 and 1849." *(S. W.* II, 80). But who was instrumental in shattering the independent position of the proletariat? By whom was the working class transformed into a tail to the bourgeoisie? By Marx and Engels? No, said Marx and Engels, by the *revolution!* "The independent movement of the working classes had, by the revolution, been broken up for a time." (79)

In April 1849 the Democrats of Cologne showed open reluctance to upholding the banner of bourgeois-democracy, and Marx realized that unless he severed connections with them, he would lose whatever contacts he still had with the workers. Among the workers support to the Communist League waxed or waned in direct proportion to their disgust with the Democrats. Nicolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen, to cover up Marx, combine the interests of the proletarist and the bourgeoisie by depicting the dreary "alliance" of the divergent classes as "necessary." At the same time, however, they record the true feelings of the workers toward this policy: "The workers had been only reluctant adherents of the necessary but disagreeable alliance with the Democrats, and the pick of them were obviously disposed to join the League and thus sever all connection with the Democratic unions. Marx may well have foreseen the danger that, if he postponed parting from the Democrats too long, it might result in isolating himself and his colleagues from the impatient workers." (194-5)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

On April 14, 1849, Marx moved Leftward and parted company with the bourgeois Democrats. A few days later the workers' organizations in Cologne withdrew from the Democratic bodies with the view to calling a congress of all proletarian unions and societies of the Rhine province and Westphalia and uniting with Born's Workers Brotherhood. *For the first time since the beginning of the revolution* Marx and Engels actually made a step in the direction of the working class movement! Mehring noted Marx's shocking line of ignoring the workers' mass movement for a whole year:

"In any case, in the spring of 1849 Marx and Engels made the first move towards the working class movement, which had developed in the meantime independent of their influence." (212)

10. *Marx Turns Back to the Left Bourgeoisie*

In May 1849 the last flare-up of the German Revolution occurred. The sporadic risings of the workers were suppressed with relative ease. "The Government's military supremacy was so great and the few fighters were so pitifully left in the lurch by the petty-bourgeoisie that the isolated outbreaks in the Rhineland collapsed in a few days. This was also the fate of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*." (N. and M-H. 195)

In the middle of May 1849 Marx was ordered expelled from the country. On his way abroad he passed through Frankfurt, and here his true political line forcefully reasserted itself. Again he turned to the bourgeois Democrats, futilely exhorting the Left deputies in the German National Assembly, a body supposedly in opposition to absolutism, to use the armed forces at its disposal, while the smoke of battle between the revolutionary workers who supported this Assembly and the Prussian battalions still hung over the country.

Marx was disappointed again. And now, though he had seen innumerable concrete manifestations of the instability of the German Democrats, Marx shifted his hopes to the French Democrats. From these brethren-in-helplessness, indecision and confusion who represented the prime class source of the defeat of the June 1848 uprising of the Paris proletariat, from these bankrupt people who were unable to help themselves, Marx, again as a Democrat, hoped to secure assistance for the revolution in Germany: "He went to Paris as the representative of the Palatinate Democratic committee to get as much help for the insurrection as he could from the French Democrats." (197-8)

During this renewal of Marx's ultra-Rightism, Engels remained in Kaiserslautern. He joined the armed struggle, in no way basing himself on a clear, scientific policy, but rather following a purely petty-bourgeois, adventurist-rebellious, Leftist spirit, as he with admirable candor wrote to Marx's wife on July 25, 1849: "In Kaiserslautern I had steered clear of any concern with the so-called revolution; but

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

when the Prussians arrived I could not resist the desire to be in the war too."

It is not difficult to see that in the Revolution of 1848 Marx and Engels were not Communists posing as bourgeois democrats but bourgeois democrats concealing their recent Communist identity.

11. *Address to the Communist League: An example of Marx's "Self-Criticism"*

Reaction was master in France, taking strong measures against the revolutionary workers as well as against the Democrats, and so, two months after his arrival from Germany, Marx joined the international political refugees fleeing across the Channel to England. In London Marx found the branch of the Communist League intact. It was here that he actually rejoined the League and again assumed leadership. Among the signs that Marx had now moved definitely to the Left was the election of Willich, a personal friend of Gottschalk's, to the Central Council of the League.

A gigantic stride away from the 1848 liquidationism and Left bourgeois politics was taken by Marx and Engels in March 1850. Acting once more as Communists, they issued the famous *Address of the Central Council of the Communist League*. The basic elements contained in the document were: 1) criticism of the recent policy in Germany; 2) evaluation of the immediate historical perspective; 3) a program of action for the German Communists.

There was a new attitude toward the petty-bourgeois Democrats which represented a complete about face. Unity with them was absolutely forbidden: "Such a union would turn out solely to their advantage and altogether to the disadvantage of the proletariat. The proletariat would lose its whole independent, laboriously obtained position and once more sink down to being an appendage of official bourgeois democracy. This union must, therefore, be most decisively rejected." (*S. W.* II, 162)

Another distinct move away from the former ultra-Rightist zigzag was the abandonment of electoral support to petty-bourgeois democracy. This, indeed, was a broad step toward establishing the political independence of the workers: "In this connection they must not allow themselves to be seduced by the phrases of the democrats, such as, for example, that by this action they are splitting the Democratic Party and giving the reaction the possibility of victory. The final intention of all such phrases is that the proletariat shall be duped. The advance which the proletarian party is bound to make by such an independent action is infinitely more important than the disadvantage that might be caused by the presence of a few reactionaries in the representative body." (165)

Thus, warning was given the workers against falling into Rightist traps, such as were later set up by Lenin in his pamphlet *Left-Wing*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Communism, by Zinoviev and Trotsky at the Fourth Congress of the Comintern, by Dimitrov at the Seventh Congress. The Address, however, contained distinct German nationalist features. It told the workers to "strive for the single and indivisible German republic," and the line of permanent revolution was posited within the context of the movement in Germany alone.

While the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* had avoided all mention of the *Communist Manifesto,* the Address brought the document prominently to the readers' attention, but, on the other hand, maintained a significant silence about the "organ of democracy."

Striking at anonymous bunglers, Marx and Engels in the Address attacked the results of their own disrupting policy. It was this portion, too, that Nicolaievsky and Maenschen-Helfen cited as "self-criticism": " 'While the organization of the Democratic Party in Germany, the party of the petty-bourgeoisie, constantly improved, the working class lost its one firm hold, remained at best organized for purely local aims in single localities and thus came completely under the domination and leadership of the petty-bourgeois Democrats in the general movement.' In these phrases Marx and Engels criticized themselves and admitted to the 'Lefts' that they had been wrong on a very definite issue." (206). The technique of "self-criticism" which Marx and Engels employed has been copied with dramatic likeness by the burocrats of all Internationals, and with identical motives. To cover up their destructive policies in order to insure the continuation of their leadership, these burocrats level strong criticism at anonymous offenders.

In Marx's "self-criticism" there is one notable feature to which his biographers failed to call attention. It is the skillful cover up of the stand Marx and Engels had taken in opposition to the Central Council in 1848-9 on the question of reestablishing the Communist League. We read in the Address: "An end must be put to this state of affairs, the independence of the workers must be restored. The Central Council realized this necessity and, therefore, already in the winter of 1848-9 it sent an emissary, Joseph Moll, to Germany for the reorganization of the League. Moll's mission, however, remained without lasting effect, partly because the German workers at that time had not acquired sufficient experience, and partly because it was interrupted by the insurrection of last May." *(S. W.* II, 157)

Here was one more *conscious* concealment of truth by Marx and Engels. It is clear that the experience of the German workers and the May 1849 events were used as a screen to hide from the League membership the fact that Marx and Engels had done all they could to hinder and defeat Moll's mission. Naturally, no one outside the leadership knew precisely what had taken place at the momentous meeting in the office of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung.*

From the time of the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in January 1848, the Central Council of the League was, in the mind of the revolutionary workers, associated with the names of Marx and Engels. These workers lacked inside information and therefore could not know that during the winter of 1848-9 Marx and Engels stood outside the Central Council and conducted a violent opposition to the policy of restoring the Communist League. Thus, by careful workmanship, Marx and Engels, the authors of the Address, consciously inserted the misleading impression that it was they who had advanced in 1848-9 the policy of reestablishing the organizational independence of the working class.

Did Marx at any time in the ensuing decades repudiate his dismal tactics of building the party of the petty-bourgeoisie which had effectively cut off the proletariat from its historical path? Did he give even a fleeting recognition to the erroneous arguments he used in support of those tactics? Never! Lenin, who apparently had profound respect for Marx's imaginary aptitude for proletarian strategy and tactics, stated in the work *Karl Marx:* "In Germany during 1848 and 1849 he supported the radical revolutionary democracy, nor subsequently did he retract what he had then said about tactics."

Just as the Bolsheviks and the leaders of international Social Democracy and Anarchism have always protected themselves by shifting the blame for the results of their conscious treachery either onto each other or onto the masses or the bourgeoisie, so did Marx in casting up the balance of his line of disruption of the Revolution of 1848. Lenin in the pamphlet *Karl Marx,* which is a biographical and political fraud covering up Marx's burocratism and many of Marx's Left bourgeois policies, records: "About twenty years afterward, writing to Engels under the date of February 11, 1865 (Briefwechsel, III, 224), Marx said that the cause of the failure of the Revolution of 1848 was that the bourgeoisie had preferred peace with slavery to the mere prospect of having to fight for freedom." *(C. W.* XVIII, 45). Lenin and all the rest of the theoretical and political leaders of the various Internationals allowed this evasion of Marx's to stand, ostensibly as Marx's profound belated scientific observation.

However, forty-four years after the disruption of the revolutionary workers' movement of 1848, Engels made an admission, at the same time, of course, concealing his own and Marx's responsibility for the policy of disruption: "The Revolution of 1848 which, under the banner of the proletariat brought the fighters of the proletariat to the point that they were pulling chestnuts out of the fire only for the bourgeoisie . . ." (Preface to the Polish Edition of the *Communist Manifesto,* 1892). However, Gottschalk was not among such "fighters of the proletariat." But with respect to the true position of Gottscalk, Marx and Engels maintained silence.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

12. *The Final Liquidation of the Communist League*

In 1850 Marx, it seemed, was done with liquidationism; in reality he was merely in transition from liquidating the independent organization during the revolution to putting an end to it in the period of political stagnation. In appearance Marx was also through with the nationalist-bourgeois policies of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. But a little over a year after the Address he showed that this was not the case. In a letter to Engels in July 1851 Marx declared: "Only the middle peasants of Hanover and the lawyers could think that the Communists have renounced the principles and policy of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* since 1850." (XXXI, R. 226)

Very soon after issuing the Address, Marx sent an emissary, Heinrich Bauer, to Germany to carry out a full-scale reconstruction of the League. Despite the strong grip of reaction, Bauer scored astonishing success on the basis of the Address. The very fact that results were achieved in an atmosphere of police repressions, with the working class considerably demoralized by defeat, serves as an additional verification of the destructiveness of Marx's previous policy.

Guided by Bauer, the reestablished League forged ahead while the morale of the democrats disintegrated and their organizations crawled into obscurity. Engels in his "History of the Communist League" described the development: "Heinrich Bauer's mission was crowned with complete success. The trusty little shoemaker was a born diplomat. He brought the former members of the League, who had partly become inactive and partly were acting on their own account, back into the active organization, and particularly also the leaders of the Workers' Brotherhood. The League began to play the dominant role in the workers', peasants', and athletic associations to a far greater extent than before 1848, so that the next Quarterly Address to the local sections in June 1850 could already report that the student Schurz from Bonn (later on American ex-minister), who was travelling in Germany in the interests of petty-bourgeois democracy, 'had found all available forces already in the hands of the League.' The League was undoubtedly the only revolutionary organization that had any significance in Germany." *(S. W.* II, 23)

In the Address Marx had foretold that "a new revolution is imminent." As the Summer of 1850 wore on, trade and industry flourished. Marx suddenly realized he had erred in his prognosis of imminent revolution and drew back to his previous stand taken in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* that the workers had to go through a protracted period of capitalism. A sharp division occurred in the Central Council of the League. The Willich-Schapper minority, having lost confidence in Marx's analysis both in political and economic fields, veered deliriously to the ultra-Left, calling for preparations for immediate insurrection in Germany. Marx, on the other side, was begin-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ning to think of withdrawing from active political life and devoting himself to the study of economy.

The League was virtually split. At this point Marx resolved to liquidate the organization once again. However he did not go to the length of burocratically dissolving it at one blow but resorted to the tactic which twenty-two years later he was to repeat with the International. At the meeting of the Central Council on September 15, 1850 his motion to remove the headquarters of the League to Cologne was carried. Willich and Schapper rejected the decision and founded a group of their own. Following the break Marx reduced his activity and even attendance in the London branch and let it stagnate.

The Cologne branch elected a new Central Council. Six months later, however, the police arrested a number of leading Communists and the famous Cologne trial followed. Marx expended much energy in exposing the police falsifications against the defendants. But after the conviction, he again, without consulting the rank and file, cast the League on the scrap heap, as recorded by Engels in his *History of the Communist League:* "Immediately after the sentence we dissolved our League; a few months later the Willich-Schapper separate organization also went to its eternal rest." (25)

Henceforth Marx bluntly resisted all efforts to involve him in attempts to resurrect the League. "Some American Communists proposed to reorganize the League at the end of the fifties, but he would have nothing to do with it." (N. and M-H. 224)

Marx retreated to his study and until 1864, when he was invited to attend the meeting which launched the First International, he never joined any working class organization.

CHAPTER IV.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE PRIVATE POLITICAL IDEOLOGY OF MARX AND ENGELS

1. *Two Sides of a German Patriotic Medal*

In Marx's system of politics the governing factor was the national axis of German-Russian relations. A bourgeois republic and a war with Russia were his chief aims in the Revolution of 1848: "The political programme of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* consisted of two main points: a single, indivisible, democratic German republic, and war with Russia, which included the restoration of Poland." *(S. W.* I, 32)

Marx's and Engels' hatred of Russia was extended also to the small Slav nations which gravitated toward Russia. In reply to Bakunin's demand for the national liberation of the Slav countries from the Austrian yoke, Engels declared: "Not on your life! Our

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

answer to the sentimental phrases about fraternity which are now offered to us on behalf of the most counter-revolutionary nations in Europe is: hatred of Russia was the first revolutionary passion of the Germans and it still is. Since the revolution this hatred of Russia has been enhanced by hatred of the Czechs and the Croats, and together with the Poles and Magyars, we can secure the victory of the revolution only by energetic terrorism against these Slav peoples." *(Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* Feb. 14, 1849; Mehring, 191)

Striking out with aggressive vigor at the oppressed Austrian Slav nationalities, Marx and Engels made no separation between the interests of the Slav workers and Slav exploiters. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* did not offer a program of liberation to the workers of the Czech and Croat nationalities. According to Engels' article, these countries were not even to have a bourgeois-democratic national independence, because, Engels decided, the Austrian Slavs "have not the first historical, geographical, political and industrial conditions for independence and national life." *(Ib.)* Despising the Slav peoples who were forcibly confined within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Engels voiced the conviction commonly mouthed by the ideologists of colonial and national oppression: "I am positive that for the majority of the Austro-Hungarian Slavs six months of independence would be sufficient for pleading that they be taken back." (Letter to Kautsky, Feb. 7, 1882)

Thus, Marx and Engels ordained one prospect for the Czech, Slovak and Croat toilers; to remain confined within the Austrian Empire, to believe in the liberating mission of bourgeois Great Germany. Bohemia, Marx and Engels intimated in their work *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution,* was destined to remain a province of Germany *for centuries:* "But as it often happens, dying Czechian nationality, dying according to every fact known in history for the last four hundred years, made in 1848 a last effort to regain its former vitality—an effort whose failure, independently of all revolutionary considerations, was to prove that Bohemia could only exist, henceforth, as a portion of Germany, although part of her inhabitants might yet, for some centuries, continue to speak a non-German language." *(S. W.* II, 91)

For some centuries? But what of the proletarian revolution and the Communist society? Surely from the tone of the *Communist Manifesto* one could hardly expect the existence some *centuries* hence of a German State with Bohemia as a German province!

2. *"Solving" the Polish Question*

Poland was held in partition by Russia, Prussia and Austria. As a solution of the Polish Question Marx and Engels presented an interesting scheme for the restoration of Poland at the expense of *Russia alone:*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"But then, the Germans had proclaimed such an enthusiasm for the restoration of Poland, that they must expect to be asked, as a first proof of the reality of their sympathies, to give up *their* share of the plunder. On the other hand, should whole tracts of land, inhabited chiefly by Germans, should large towns, entirely German be given up to a people that as yet had never given any proofs of its capability of progressing beyond a state of feudalism based upon agricultural serfdom? The question was intricate enough. The only possible solution was in a war with Russia. The question of delimitation between the different revolutionised nations would have been made a secondary one to that of first establishing a safe frontier against the common enemy; the Poles, by receiving extended territories in the east would have become more tractable and reasonable in the west." (89)

Marx and Engels would have helped the Poles acquire parts of Russia in return for letting Germany keep parts of Western Poland: "Riga and Mitau would have been deemed, after all, quite as important to them as Danzig and Elbing." (89-90). Stripped of its "democratic" coating, the "Riga and Mitau" thesis would seem to mean that Marx and Engels intended to act generously toward Poland by offering it the territories east of Poland proper inhabited by Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians and Bielo-Russians. In reality this "Riga" arrangement for the "restoration" of Poland was produced for the public eye only. Privately Marx and Engels had an altogether different plan regarding Poland. In a letter to Marx dated 23 of May 1851 Engels expounded his real view on Polish "liberation" in outspoken terms: "The more I think over the business the clearer it becomes to me that the Poles as a nation are done for and can only be made use of as an instrument until Russia herself is swept into the agrarian revolution. From that moment onwards Poland will have absolutely no more reason for existence. The Poles have never done anything in history except play at brave, quarrelsome stupidity. And one cannot point to a single instance in which Poland represented progress successfully, even if only in relation to Russia, or did anything at all of historic importance." (*Sel. Cor.* 37). What, then, was Engels' conclusion regarding the future status of Poland? "Conclusion: To take away as much as possible from Western Poland, to occupy her fortresses, especially Posen, with Germans, under the pretext of defense, to let them make a mess of things for themselves, to drive them into the fire, to eat up their country, to feed them on hopes of Riga and Odessa, and if the Russians can be got to move, to form an alliance with them and force the Poles to give way." (38)

Thus, Engels, ostensibly a proletarian revolutionist, in reality an inveterate German nationalist, secretly projected a scheme to create a Russo-German nutcracker to crush Poland. If Stalin required an authoritative hint as to policy during his 1939 diplomatic negotiations with Hitler for the partition of Poland, he probably found it in

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the private correspondence between the two authors of the *Communist Manifesto.*

We have shown the secret attitude of Marx and Engels toward Poland. But their open line to direct the attention of the workers to the *Russian* side of the Polish question and thus divert them from the German is truly a master-piece of double-talk. Engels himself posed the question, since it probably occurred to many workers: "But why is it that in connection with Poland we constantly mention only Russia alone? Didn't the two German powers, Austria and Prussia, take part in the robbery? Isn't part of Poland enslaved by them and aren't they, together with Russia, striving to suppress every Polish national movement?" ("Of What Concern is Poland to the Working Class?" XIII Pt 1, R. 152; *Commonwealth,* March 1866). Here is his answer: "Austria has sufficiently often indicated that oppression of weaker nations is habitual with its rulers. But in the case of Poland the instinct of self-preservation turned out to be stronger than the appetite for new territories or the habit of the Government. That's why at the present time the question has nothing to do with Austria.

"As to Prussia, the part of Poland which Prussia owns is too insignificant to have much weight. Its friend and ally Russia freed her of nine-tenths of what she received during the three partitions. But even what little share she did get is choking her like an incubus. This chained her to the triumphal chariot of Russia, this gave her government the possibility even in 1863 and 1864 to violate the law in Prussian Poland, encroach upon personal freedom, upon the right of assembly, freedom of the press and soon after that to resort to similar violations in the rest of the country. This perverted the whole liberal movement of the bourgeoisie which out of the fear of risking the loss of several square miles of territory on the eastern border permitted the Government to place the Poles beyond the pale of law. The workers not only of Prussia but of entire Germany in general, more than the workers of any other country, are interested in the restoration of Poland, and in all the revolutionary activity they have demonstrated that they are cognizant of this. The liberation of Poland signifies to them the liberation of their own country from the vassal dependence on Russia. That's why we also think that the question has nothing to do with Prussia. When the working class of Russia (if it exists in that country in the Western European sense) creates a political program and this program contains the liberation of Poland, then and only then will the question also have nothing to do with Russia as a nation and the culprit will remain only the Tsarist government." (152-3)

The crux behind this piece of nationalist legerdemain with which Marx and Engels protected the Austrian and Prussian robber interests in Poland was that they wanted Poland, as well as other lesser Slav countries, to be retained within the German orbit. It was no accident, therefore, that Engels in his private correspondence revealed

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his plan to keep Prussian Poland: "We must not give up a single inch of Prussian Poland." (Letter to Lassalle, May 18, 1859; XXV, R. 262)

Was Lenin aware of Engels' Prussian robber project? Definitely! In an article "On the Right of Nations to Self-determination," written in 1914, he directly mentions Engels' letter of May 23, 1851, which contains this predatory German national platform. Did Lenin condemn this nefarious scheme? Not at all! He withheld any reference to Engels' programmatic outline "to eat up" Poland. Instead he served up the following fraud: "It is known that K. Marx and F. Engels considered it absolutely obligatory for the entire west-European democracy, and the more so for the Social democracy, actively to support the demand for the independence of Poland." (Lenin, XIX, R. 131-2)

3. *German "Civilization" Vs. Danish "Barbarism"*

Tiny Denmark, whose rulers refused to give up two duchies, Schleswig and Holstein, to the potential "single, indivisible, democratic German republic," was detested by Marx and Engels. Demanding the German annexation of Schleswig, Marx buttressed this claim by granting the right of French territorial expansionism. He declared in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung:* "Germany must take Schleswig with the same justification that France took Flanders, Alsace and Lorraine, and sooner or later will take Belgium. It is the right of civilization against barbarism, of progress against stagnation." (Cited by Mehring, 196). Marx's position on Belgium represented a complete disregard of the political wishes of the masses of that country who, he decided, must be crushed by a big power in the interests of "civilization." But Engels later admitted: "The Belgian French . . . do not want political unification with France." (XIII, Pt I, R. 156)

It would be an error to think that in their demand for the annexation of Schleswig and Holstein, Marx and Engels were motivated by ethnographical considerations. They were looking forward to the future of Germany, bourgeois or national-proletarian, and they wanted those duchies on the Baltic coast to strengthen the position of Germany economically, militarily and as a naval power. In justifying support to the recent German war for wresting Schleswig and Holstein from Denmark, Marx and Engels wrote quite frankly in *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution:* "Lastly, there was the war with Denmark about Schleswig and Holstein. These countries, unquestionably German by nationality, language and predilection, are also from military, naval and commercial grounds necessary to Germany." *(S. W.* II, 94)

Marx's and Engels' argument that Schleswig and Holstein were "from military, naval and commercial grounds necessary to Germany" is not to be taken lightly. The question of German commerce, and

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

particularly of German military and naval interests formed the pivot of their ideology in the next decades, indeed remained so to the end of their lives.

Viewed superficially, Marx's ideology appears to be a commingling of numerous contradictory elements. Upon a close study, however, when his political mosaic is pieced together, he is seen as a consistent German patriot, planning, eventually, to establish a national proletarian State in Greater Germany. But before posing this ultimate aim he pursued a policy of creating a cohesive bourgeois Greater Germany. From this angle the German occupation of the Baltic Coast was essential. When the King of Prussia, under the threat of intervention by England and Russia, called off the war against Denmark and ordered his troops to withdraw from the Duchies, Marx and Engels were infuriated. They branded the King's yielding to the pressure as a "betrayal of the honor and interests of Germany." (Marx-Engels *Gesamt-Ausgabe,* Erste Abteilung, Band 7, 223). Feeling deeply for the "honor" of bourgeois Germany they ruefully observed: "The honor of Germany is in bad hands." (VI, R. 431)

4. *The Italian War*

Italy was a dismembered bourgeois nation under Austrian domination. For a brief spell this domination was replaced by Napoleon's dictatorship but Austrian control was reestablished after his fall. In the Revolution of 1848 the Italian masses and the bourgeois democrats, led by Garibaldi and Mazzini, expelled the Austrians but due to the defeat of the revolution in the rest of Europe, Austrian absolutism, aided by the French Republic, restored its power in Rome, Venice, Milan and other Italian cities.

Marx and Engels, upon their entry into the Communist League, advanced various positions on Italy. In September 1847, only three months before they wrote in the *Manifesto* that the Pope, the Tsar and other reactionary forces of Europe had formed an alliance to exorcise the spectre of Communism, they presented this very Pope as a champion of *freedom* and *progress* ready to fight for the liberation of the Italian masses: "Pope Pius IX has raised the banner of freedom and progress, and the Italian people have rallied to him with real enthusiasm . . . It is said, however, that the Pope announced that in the event Metternich attacks him he himself will mount a horse and at the head of his people will march against the Austrian hirelings. Bravo!" *(Kommunistische Leitschrift,* Sep. 1847; cited, Riazanov ed. *Com. Man.* 302)

However, despite the fantastic evaluation by Marx and Engels, the Pope's "banner of freedom and progress" was no more than a few Liberal concessions to the petty bourgeoisie. And when the Revolution of 1848 shook Europe from Ireland to the Danube, and the King of Sardinia declared war on Austria, the Pope, fearing a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

schism in the Church if he attacked Catholic Austria, enjoined his own army from advancing beyond the Italian border. In an Encyclical (April 29, 1848) he declared that his position as Pope forbade him to declare war on Austria.

The Italian crisis simmered on for years. In 1859, Piedmont (Sardinia), which was not under Austrian rule, gathered an army of volunteers who had poured in from all parts of Italy, and, in alliance with Louis Napoleon of France, stood ready for war. Austria served an ultimatum on Piedmont (April 23, 1859) demanding disarmament and when the ultimatum was ignored the Austrian Emperor, Francis Joseph, declared war and invaded Piedmont. This was followed by a French declaration of war on Austria.

In this situation there was only one correct position for a true proletarian revolutionist: to call on the workers in both war camps to break with their national bourgeoisie and feudal aristocracy and to unite the Italian, French, German and other workers to establish a World-Democratic Proletarian State. But Marx and Engels presented a different position. Engels, "forgetting" the principle, enunciated in the *Manifesto*, that the workers had no fatherland, followed the line that he and Marx had a fatherland—*Germany!* In a work *Po and Rhine* he foreshadowed an aggressive German future on the basis of national unification. No one had a clearer understanding of the German-patriotic, and essentially Prussian-military character, of Engels' work *Po and Rhine* than Marx. He showed this understanding in a letter to Lassalle dated February 25, 1859: "Engels is preparing to publish—*anonymously* at first—a small brochure under the title *Po and Rhine . . . But the publisher must keep the name of the author secret* until the 'author' himself reveals it. You may be certain it will be suspected that it was written by one of Prussia's great military writers." (XXV, R. 243, 244)

Indeed, two years after the publication of the pamphlet Marx wrote Engels that such actually was the opinion in high Prussian and Austrian circles: "Incidentally, regarding your *Po and Rhine*, etc., I was told by Hatzfeld who meets the entire Prussian high military at the home of her brother-in-law and whose nephew, another Nostitz, is an adjutant to 'Wilhelm the handsome' that in the high and the highest military circles (including the circle of Prince Karl-Friedrich) your book is considered to be the work of an anonymous Prussian general. The same in Vienna as I was told by the Assessor Friedlander." (May 7, 1861. XXIII, R. 17)

It is obviously impossible to quote the entire pamphlet in these pages, so we shall limit ourselves to one of the self-expository German-nationalist passages: "But if the map of Europe will be revised, then we, Germans, have a right to demand that it should be done thoroughly and impartially, and sacrifices should be demanded not only from Germany, as was the usual case heretofore when all the other nations only gained from such redivisions without sacrificing anything. We can

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

relinquish much that has been tacked on to the borders of our country and that entangles us in affairs in which it would be better for us not to interfere directly. But this concerns all the others as well; let them show us an example of unselfishness or let them better be silent. The final deduction from all this investigation consists in that we,Germans, would conclude a remarkable deal if we could exchange Po, Mincio, Adige and the whole Italian rubbish for the *unification* of Germany which would safeguard us against the repetition of Warsaw and Bronnzell and which alone can make us powerful within and without. As soon as we achieve this unity we *can* cease conducting the defense. Then we won't need any Mincio. Then again 'the essence of our spirit will consist in attacking' and there exist such rotten places where this will be quite necessary." (XI, Pt II, R. 50)

And to steer "the nation" away from death-dealing reefs, there would arise, Engels believed, a new power in Germany, the national proletarian party, naturally headed by Marx and himself. A clear note of this feeling is discernible in the following lines written in the period when he produced *Po and Rhine:* "We Germans must be in the most desperate situation before we can be moved *en masse* by the furor *teutonicus,* and this time our plight seems desperate enough. *Tant mieux.* At such a crisis the powers that be are bound to fall, and the moment will come when only the most determined and relentless party can save the nation." (Engels to Lassalle, May 18, 1859; XXV, R. 262)

On the same day, May 18, 1859, Marx, in a letter to Engels, expressed agreement with the thesis that the German States, including Prussia, must be *patriotic* and support the Austrian Empire: "As to the 'governments,' it is obvious from every point of view, if only for the sake of Germany's *existence,* that the demand must be put to them *not to remain neutral,* but, as you rightly say, to be patriotic." *(Sel. Cor.* 122). In an article Marx declared: "The armed intervention of Prussia, that is, its alliance with Austria, means revolution." *(Das Volk,* June 25, 1859; XI, Pt 2, R. 302)

On the issue of the Italian War one finds contradictions among Marx's followers. In 1916 Zinoviev, under Lenin's guidance, wrote a work *The War and the Crisis of Socialism* in which, taking up the complicated 1859 relationship between Italy and Louis Napoleon, he declared: "And in spite of that, the War of 1859 was, in *historical* respects, a just war of defense on the part of Italy, that is, a war in which Cavour and Garibaldi stood on the side of progress and fought for the cause of bourgeois national-state unification against the feudal national and state atomization." *(New Int.* March 1939, 83). This evaluation clearly placed Marx and Engels in the camp of German oppressors, where they actually stood. The Trotsky leaders decided to support Zinoviev's evaluation as correct. Calling themselves 'revolutionary' Marxists they stated in an editorial note introducing Zinoviev's position: "Whatever differences the revolutionary Marxists had with

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Zinoviev of his last years, they can subscribe entirely to the unassailable and to this day wholly valid Leninist analysis he made so brilliantly in the work from which the following chapter is taken.—Ed." (81)

So the Trotsky Marxists, in a contradictory mess as ever, approved the position of Zinoviev, the Marxist, which was contrary to that taken by Marx himself. They described Zinoviev's position as "Leninist." But, interestingly, though Lenin never advanced any criticism of Zinoviev's evaluation, he himself in 1915 had written an opposite opinion with which Zinoviev never disagreed, and, therefore, evidently concurred in. Lenin stated:

"We think that (despite Mehring) Marx was right . . . Prussia's interference in the War of 1859 against Napoleon would have stimulated the movement of the people of Germany." ("Under the Stolen Flag," *C. W.* XVIII, 122). However, in the Lenin-Zinoviev compilation *Against the Current,* in an article which ends with the cry "Back to Marx! And in the name of this—a Third International!" we read on page 491: "In 1859 the matter concerned the liberation of Italy from the foreign yoke of Austria, a matter of creating Italian unity in which the *entire people, all democracy* was interested. Austria was the oppressor, Italy the oppressed."

A year before the October Revolution Inessa Armand, a very close follower of Lenin's, caught him contradicting himself on Marx. In his reply to Armand, Lenin indicated that he was familiar with *Po and Rhine* and once again illustrated that his method of putting over his policy was by twisting the truth. He pretended to see no contradiction between Marx's theoretical postulate contained in the *Manifesto* and Marx's concrete German-nationalist politics. And he again whitewashed Engels on Social Democratic support to the German Empire in 1891:

"Dear Friend! Concerning 'defence of the fatherland,' I do not know whether there are differences between us or not. You find a contradiction between my articles in the symposium 'In Memory of Marx' and my statements now . . . it seems to me that you are arguing somewhat one-sidedly and formalistically. You have taken *one* quotation from the *Communist Manifesto* (the workers have no fatherland) and want, seemingly without reservations, to apply it *even so far as to deny national wars* . . . In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels stated that the workers have no fatherland. But this same Marx *called* for *national* war more than once: Marx in 1848, Engels in 1859 (the end of his pamphlet *Po and Rhine,* where the *national* sentiment of the Germans is positively inflamed, they positively call them to a national *war*). Engels in 1891, in view of the then menacing and approaching war of France (Boulanger) plus Alexander III against Germany, *positively* recognized 'defence of the fatherland.' Were Marx and Engels muddlers who said one thing one day and the next day something else? No. In my opinion, recognition of 'defense of the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

fatherland' in a national war *fully* accords with Marxism. In 1891 the German Social Democrats *should,* indeed, *have* defended the fatherland in the war against Boulanger plus Alexander III. This would have been a particular variety of *national* war." (Lenin to Inessa Armand, Nov. 30, 1916; *Labour Monthly,* June 1940, 189-190)

While Lenin wrote this to Armand, he published Zinoviev's article written in October 1916, which stated: "Looking back now we see that the era of modern imperialism began in the Nineties and even in the Eighties . . . The union of Germany and Austria was concluded in 1878. In 1882 this dual alliance became transformed into a triple one. Italy joined Germany and Austria, guided by purely imperialist considerations." *(Ag. the Cur.* R. 470)

5. *The True Nature of Marx's Anti-Russian Position*

From the documentary material presented thus far the story, cooked up by Marx and "immortalized" by his burocratic followers, that Russia was the chief barrier to the proletarian revolution in Europe has been pretty well exposed as a cloak for his German nationalist ends. Few pieces of substantiating evidence in the matter are as precise and precious as Engels' ultra-reactionary patriotic masterpiece, the pamphlet *Savoy, Nice and Rhine* written shortly after *Po and Rhine* had been printed. Bitter over the setbacks Germany had suffered at the hands of the Tsars, Engels called for a *German* war on Russia to avenge his fatherland. Here Engels divested himself utterly of the "proletarian" disguise which he wore in his guarded periods to deceive the revolutionary workers. Without paying attention to political and class distinctions he appealed for complete unity of the German people to conduct a war of national revenge. We call special attention to Engels' indignation at Russia's diplomatic pressure which had prevented the lesser German States from giving military assistance to Austria in the Italian War: "What role Russia intends to play in relation toward us, Germans, is clearly seen from the known circular note which Prince Gorchakov addressed to the lesser German States. Never was Germany spoken to in such language. The Germans, let us hope, will never forget that Russia took the liberty of forbidding them to come to the assistance of a German State which was attacked. (Sic!—G. S.). The Germans, let us hope, will also not forgive Russia many other things. In 1807, during the conclusion of the Tilsit Peace, Russia insisted on getting the Belostok region which belonged to her ally Prussia, and betrayed Germany to Napoleon." (XIII, Pt. I, R. 244)

And Engels continued enumerating German nationalist grievances against Russia. Then—"Are we, a forty-five million people, to tolerate much longer that one of our most beautiful, richest and most industrial provinces should serve as a bait which Russia is dangling before the French pretorian power? Don't the Rhenish lands have

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

= Mozilla/5.0
ITTP_ACCEPT-

any other purpose than to serve as war booty so that Russia could get a free hand on the Danube and the Vistula? That's how the question is posed. We hope that Germany will reply with arms in hand. If we all stand together we shall get rid of both the French pretorians and the Russian Cossacks." (246). Thus, Engels stood for the political fusion of the German proletariat with the bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy for the sake of avenging Germany's "honor" by punishing the Russian offender. "The only possible solution which will preserve Germany's honor and Germany's interests is, we repeat, a war with Russia." *(Marx-Engels Gesamt-Ausgabe,* Erste Abteilung, Band 7, 304)

Engels' *Savoy, Nice and Rhine* was anonymously published to conceal the identity of its author from the workers. This work alone is eloquent evidence of the purely German nationalist reasons behind Marx's anti-Russian policy. Officially, before the workers, Marx and Engels, of course, pretended that this patriotic policy based on unity with the German bourgeoisie and nobility was a proletarian-revolutionary line in the interests of Socialism.

6. *Marx and the Russo-Turkish War*

In the course of his long political life Marx presented different views on the question of Turkey. At one time he was for the dissolution of the "Moslem Empire." (IX, 397; *N. Y. Daily Tr.* April 19, 1853). However, his attitude toward Russia swung him to the position for the preservation of that Empire, and he gave a crass expression to this policy during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-78. In that period Turkey was still a vast semi-barbaric empire, in some ways more savage than Russia. Turkey's social structure was rotten with feudal decay, its landlords were brutal and blood-thirsty, its peasantry in rags, imbued with religious fanaticism, its government corrupt, incompetent, oppressive and bankrupt.

How did Marx and Engels compare Turkey with Russia prior to the Near Eastern War Crisis? Writing to Marx a whole decade before the Tsar officially abolished serfdom, Engels, in a letter dated May 23, 1851, "analized" Tsarist Russia as progressive not only in relation to the East but even as compared with Poland! "And one cannot point to a single instance in which Poland represents progress successfully, even in relation to Russia, or did anything at all of historic importance. Russia, on the other hand, is really progressive in relation to the East. For all its baseness and slavonic dirt, Russian domination is a civilizing element on the Black Sea, the Caspian Sea and Central Asia and among the Bashkirs and Tartars, and Russia has absorbed far more civilizing and especially industrial elements than the Poles, whose whole nature is that of the idle cavalier." *(Sel. Cor.* 37)

An interesting facet of the political nature of Marx and Engels is their reaction to the abominable acts perpetrated by the Turkish

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

= Mozilla/5.0
TTP_ACCEPT-

government on the Bulgarian peasants. In 1861 the Turkish government seized many acres of land from the Bulgarian peasants and settled Crimean Tartars and wild Circassian Mountaineers on it. For years Bulgaria seethed with discontent and in 1876 the peasants rose in revolt. The savagery of the suppression horrified the entire world. As the bourgeois historians state, "Bands of bashi-bazouks were let loose throughout the district by the Turkish authorities, the Pomaks, or Moslem Bulgarians, and the Circassian colonists were called to arms, and a succession of horrors followed to which a parallel can scarcely be found in the history of the middle ages." *(Enc. Br.* IV, 781)

There were three Bulgarian tendencies opposing Turkish rule: Two were of the upper classes. "The third tendency, fighting against the oppression by the charbadges, usurers and capitalists, aimed at social emancipation. In it participated the representatives of the city poor and the peasant serfs. Its leaders were V. Levsky and especially the poet Christian Botev, who was influenced by the utopian Socialism of Chernovsky, a pupil of Bakunin and Nechaev. Botev called himself a Communist. When the insurrection of the Herzogovinians took place (1875) Bulgaria was covered with a network of revolutionary organizations. They grew stronger particularly at the beginning of 1876. In 1876 a general uprising was prepared in which however only the peasants, the city poor and handicraftsmen of several regions took part. It was crushed by the Turks. Botev himself with a detachment entered Bulgaria and fell in combat with the Turkish troops." *(Gr. Sov. Enc. "Bulgaria")*

The British Prime Minister, Disraeli, who was understood to represent the traditional British policy of maintaining Turkish domination in the Balkans, dismissed the atrocity reports as "coffee-house babble." However, an official investigation established the veracity of the reports, and the British Liberals raised a clamor for Turkey's expulsion from the Balkans. Several months later, despite the substantiation of the reports, Engels dismissed the horrible outrages with the contemptuous remark "the so-called Turkish atrocities." Criticising the British labor leaders and Eccarius, former General Secretary of the International who had broken with Marx, Engels wrote: "The so-called leaders, including Eccarius, are trailing behind the Liberal bourgeoisie, are selling themselves to it in the capacity of agitators against the so-called Turkish atrocities and preach in the interests of humanism and freedom the treacherous turning over of the Balkan Peninsula to the Russians." (Letter to Becker, Dec. 21, 1876. XXVI, R. 443)

Sultan Abdul Hamid, yielding to the demands of the British, French and German rulers, who required a mask of decency in their diplomatic relations with the Turkish government, wrapped his Oriental despotism in a European "constitutional" cloak and summoned a "parliament." Marx and Engels, naturally, could not have misunderstood the meaning of this tactic. On the day this "constitu-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
TP_ACCEPT-

tional change" was enacted a conference of the great European powers opened at Constantinople (Dec. 23, 1876). But Marx and Engels pretended they saw in the tactical versatility of the European powers and the Sultan's political deception a true bourgeois-liberal development in the vicious Ottoman Empire. Engels "liberalized" even a section of the Turkish landlords. He wrote to Bracke on June 25, 1877: "You will be yet more amazed as to what the Turks are capable of. If only we in Germany had such a parliament as in Constantinople! As long as the mass of the people remains healthy—in this instance the Turkish peasant and even the middle Turkish landlord, and this is precisely the case—such an Eastern society can withstand the most incredible blows."

By a sleight of hand Marx and Engels transformed the Turkish landlords—not even the small landlords who were just a rung above the peasantry, but the *middle* landlords, real exploiters and oppressors of the agricultural toilers—into a healthy social element! Marx and Engels pretended to take at face value Abdul Hamid's "parliamentary" masquerade and shut their eyes to the frightful massacres of the Bulgarian peasants and workers by the Sultan's hangmen.

When the Russo-Turkish War broke out Marx and Engels unofficially adopted a position on the conflict. It goes without saying that in a war between the two blackest reactionary powers in Europe, a proletarian-revolutionist would have declared against both the Tsar and the Sultan. Marx and Engels viewed the situation differently. In a letter to Wilhelm Liebknecht, on February 4, 1878, Marx wrote:

"We are most decidedly taking the side of the Turks for two reasons:

"1) Because we have studied the Turkish peasant—consequently the Turkish masses—and we see in his person unquestionably one of the most capable and most upright representative of the peasantry in Europe . . ." (XV, R. 379)

What was so particularly upright in the Turkish peasants as compared with the Bulgarian or Serbian peasants? In what way were the Armenian, Rumanian, Greek and Arab peasants, all living under the Sultan's oppression and slavery, less "capable and morally upright" than the Turkish?

In the above-cited letter to Liebknecht, Marx stated "we have studied the Turkish peasants." Marx knew, therefore, the appalling poverty and misery in which the ruling class of Turkey kept its peasantry. Whether the Turkish peasantry was "morally upright" or not, it was Marx's duty, were he truly a proletarian-revolutionist, to side with this peasantry against its national blood-suckers and their Government. Marx did the very opposite. By what curious "reasoning" did Marx arrive at the manifestly preposterous conclusion that since the Turkish peasants stood high in moral virtue he had to be in favor of the Sultan's victory and consequently opposed to their class interests?

Records show that Marx and Engels, even in the internal situa-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
ACCEPT-

tion of the Ottoman Empire, before and after the Russo-Turkish War, when the issue of the military defeat of Russian Tsarism did not enter, sided with the interests of the Turkish rulers against the interests of the oppressed. Thus after the war, when the Ottoman Empire was again threatened with revolts of the oppressed nationalities, Engels, apprehensive lest the Turkish power collapse in Europe, wrote to Marx on September 21, 1878: "This is the right moment for some kind of a change in Constantinople. Otherwise the numerous provincial revolts will create a situation leading to the dissolution of European Turkey, that is, they will lead precisely to what the Russians and Bismarck want . . ." (XXIV, R. 150)

An interesting line of reasoning was unfolded by Engels regarding the Servo-Bulgarian War of 1885. Bulgaria had gained independence from Turkey and had drifted into the Russian sphere of influence. Now, however, there was a rift between Russia and Bulgaria, and therefore Engels' axis for the moment was not the "East-West" antagonism invented by Marx but the issue of national independence of the Balkan countries. Engels' stand in support of the Turkish oppressors led him to the view that the Bulgarians would have been better off if they had not thrown off the Sultan's yoke. Slavery under the Sultan, Engels attempted to show, had some attractive aspects; whereas independence, he held, had proved to be detrimental to the Serbs, and would do no good to the Bulgarians:

"Let the Bulgars have sixty years of bourgeois development (which in any event will lead them nowhere) and burocratic administration, and they will find themselves in a similar miserable situation as the Serbs now. For the Bulgars and for us it would have been incomparably better if they had remained under Turkish rule until the European revolution." (Letter to Bernstein, Oct. 9, 1886. XXVII, R. 496-7)

In his "analysis" of the Bulgarian people Engels was not guided by the *class* approach, was not basing his conclusions on a study of the historical development of this national entity but yielded to his subjective anti-Bulgarian frame of mind. He summed up his conclusions which he drew from reading some allegedly Bulgarian folk songs:

"The Bulgarians have characterized themselves in their folk songs compiled recently by a Frenchman and published in Paris. A large part in these songs is taken up with fires. A house is burning, a young woman perishes in the fire because her husband prefers to rescue his black mare instead. In another song a young woman is salvaging her ornaments and leaves her child in the fire. If by way of exception something is said about some noble, courageous act, it is always performed by a Turk. Where else, then, in the world will you find such a piggish people?" (Letter to Bernstein, Feb. 22, 1882, 196)

Care must be taken not to overestimate Marx's and Engels' love for the Turkish oppressors. They merely had their preference as to which specific power should conquer and exploit each particular

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4ozilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

country. In the case of Mexico they showed definite partiality to the United States. For Belgium they chose France. Bohemia (Czechoslovakia) could live only as a province of Germany. The Tsar exerted a "civilizing influence" on the Bashkirs and Tartars, whom he oppressed, but the control of the Balkans Marx and Engels would entrust only to the Turks. However, they evidently did not favor Turkish rule in India: "Indian society has no history at all, at least no known history. What we call its history, is but the history of the successive intruders who founded their empires on the passive basis of that unresisting and unchanging society. The question, therefore, is not whether the English had a right to conquer India, but whether we are to prefer India conquered by the Turk, by the Persian, by the Russian, to India conquered by the Briton. England has to fulfill a double mission in India: one destructive, and the other regenerating —the annihilation of old Asiatic society, and the laying the material foundation of Western society in Asia." *(S. W.* 657-8)

7. *Marx's German Nationalist Vanity*

Marx and Engels had a grandiose self-delusion as to the superiority of the "German mind." They believed that no other national "mind" possessed the agility, the quickness, the natural predilection for study, the necessary training to absorb deep learning that the "German mind" did. Thus, in a review of Marx's *Capital,* Engels proudly declared: "No matter what the attitude toward the tendency of this book, still we consider that we have a right to say it belongs to the category of works which do honor to the German mind." (XIII, Pt 1, R. 221). In another review of *Capital,* Engels stated: ". . . We are a people of thinkers . . ." (214). Engels boasted of a wide mental horizon of the Germans, such, he declared, as was denied to other nationalities: "Of all the people, the German in the greatest degree, and perhaps virtually they alone, possess the historical understanding, and, therefore, in the nature of things, it is again precisely a German who uncovers the historical relations also in the domain of political economy." (220)

Mehring mentions a discussion between Engels and Sorge on the question of letting American workers study the *Communist Manifesto.* To Engels the idea was preposterous. How could the *American mind* grasp the theories which only the intelligence of the *German mind* could master! "And when Sorge objected that the Manifesto had exercised great influence on him when he had first read it, although he had been only a boy at the time, Engels replied: 'You were Germans forty years ago with the German capacity for theory, and therefore the Manifesto had its effect on you, but although it was translated into English, French, Flemish, Danish, etc., it had absolutely no effect on the other peoples." *(Karl Marx,* 338)

Engels' own gifted mind tripped up badly in its thinking every

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
TP_ACCEPT-

time he was fired with the fanatical German "superiority" passion. The ability to comprehend complex theoretical propositions is not a *national* attribute but is determined by historical, political and economic conditions of society as a whole at a given moment and an individual's relationship to it. In ancient China, Greece and Egypt and other lands there arose eminent scholars, colossuses of knowledge, dialectic thinkers while the "German mind" was still in the cranium of barbarian Teutons in the forests of northern Europe.

Marx too often evinced inflated German nationalist priggishness. Writing about the German workers, he said: "On the other hand they undoubtedly have the advantage of beginning the movement at a period when conditions are much more advanced than they were for the English and, *being Germans,* of having heads on their shoulders capable of generalizing." (Letter to Engels, Sep. 26, 1868. *Sel. Cor.* 249. Our emph.—G. S.). Referring to Joseph Dietzgen, a German worker, tanner by profession, Marx wrote to Kugelmann on December 7, 1867: "Engels remarks, quite rightly, that the autodidactic philosophy—pursued by workers themselves—has made great progress in the case of this tanner in comparison with the cobbler Jacob Bohm; also that only 'German workers' are capable of such cerebral work."

It always made Marx happy to think that he was German: "Fortunately we are Germans, not Scythians." (I, R. 404). "We German theoreticians" (Engels, introduction to the *Condition of the Working Class in England,* III, R. 299)

The undisguised German nationalist conceit of Marx and Engels had another side, equally destructive to the interests of the proletariat. Their attitude toward the "inferior" races and nationalities, especially those affecting the interests of German destiny, was scornful and insolent. They were particularly contemptuous of the Slavs in the Balkans —"the lousy Balkan people" (Engels to Bebel, Dec. 1882; cited by Mayer in *Friedrich Engels,* 289)

One should not get the erroneous impression that Marx and Engels regarded all Germans as representing the "superior" German mind. To them most Germans—apart from the nameless masses—were philistines, idiots, dogs, swine and asses, as one finds in their private correspondence. Only a definite double personal entity, Marx and Engels, and a few of their immediate followers were representative of the "superior" German mind.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER V.

MARX'S PERSONAL AND POLITICAL INSINCERITY

1. *The Double Game with Lassalle*

WITH THE final acceptance of Marx by the vast majority of the burocratic "revolutionists" in Germany, France, Russia, Britain, United States and other countries they developed an atmosphere of hero-worship about his name. Here is a sample of personal glorification of both Marx and Engels. "Both of them, especially Engels, could at any moment say of themselves that nothing human was alien to them. But their revolutionary outlook, having turned into nerves, lifted them always above the incidents of fate and the works of men. Pettiness was incompatible not only with their character but even with their presences. Vulgarity could not stick even to the soles of their shoes. Their appraisals, sympathies, jests, even when most commonplace, had the freshness of the mountain air of spiritual nobility. They may pass deadly criticism on a man, but they would never engage in gossip." (Trotsky, *My Life,* I, 240). Another adulator of Marx left these reassuring words regarding Marx's personal integrity: "And Marx was never hypocritical. He was simply incapable of it—exactly like a spoiled child . . ." (Wilhelm Liebknecht, *From Reminiscences of Marx)*

Marx did not live to shake hands with Trotsky, who, as we have seen, was one of the most consummate liars of the epoch of the Bolshevik State. However, Marx did know his Wilhelm Liebknecht: "Our Wilhelm (Liebknecht) is sanguine and a liar." (Letter to Engels, July 3, 1869). And when Wilhelm Liebnecht said "Marx was never hypocritical" he definitely lied. Marx was permeated with insincerity, not only with regard to the proletariat but also in personal relations. In the latter respect one of the outstanding examples is his attitude toward Lassalle's work *Heraclitus.* In his correspondence with Engels, Marx spoke contemptuously of both the author and his work. On February 1, 1858, before he actually read the book, Marx wrote to Engels: " 'Heraclitus the Dark' by Lassalle the Bright is in reality a nonsensical work . . . as soon as I thumb through the book I'll send it to you." (XXII, R.). On May 31, 1858 Marx sent his opinion of the book to Lassalle. But during the intervening four months Lassalle had performed a very important service for Marx. He had found a publisher for Marx's work, the *Critique of Political Economy,* and made all the arrangements for its publication. While Lassalle was working on this, Marx was impelled to acknowledge Lassalle's friendly attitude: "I shall begin by stating that no matter what the results of your negotiations—successful or not—I must express my ardent thanks for your efforts the value of which is enhanced 100% when one takes into consideration the fact that you are not well." (March 11, 1858, XXV, R. 225). Finally Lassalle's endeavors were crowned with complete success. He informed Marx, who was ill at the time, and in

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

return received a letter from Marx's wife: "It is so difficult for him to write that he asked me to convey to you his hearty thanks for your friendly endeavors in his behalf. On my part I cannot refrain from expressing my joy regarding the happy conclusion of the contract." (April 9, 1858, XXV, R. 227)

It was thus in a very important moment for Marx that he wrote to Lassalle giving his opinon of *Heraclitus*. Marx praised the work in these words: "During my illness I carefully read your Heraclitus and find that the reconstruction of his system from the scattered fragments he left behind has been done masterly. No less do I like the witty polemic." (220). Were these words sincere? On the *same day* Marx wrote to Engels: "I at last wrote to Lassalle. You'll have to forgive me for the praise which I was compelled to make for Heraclitus the Dark." (XXII, R. 340)

It is obvious that one cannot determine with certainty what Marx thought of the work. On the one hand, he was guided by his and Engels' dislike of Lassalle, and, on the other hand, by the need to humor Lassalle because the man had done him an inestimable turn. This totalled up to an insincere attitude toward Lassalle.

Perhaps of a more serious nature is another aspect of the insincere face which Marx presented to Lassalle. It is well known to students of the views of Marx and of Lassalle that the two differed on vital questions in political economy. It is sufficient to cite Lassalle's "iron law of wages" against Marx's formulation that wages are an elastic entity. Lassalle was frank about the conflict of political-economic views, but Marx, because of Lassalle's friendly offices, not merely evaded the differences but actually pretended that Lassalle and he were in ideological collaboration in establishing a *German* political-economic science: "In your Frankfurt letter you said nothing of your economic work. Insofar as our rivalry is concerned, I do not think that the German public is suffering from over-plenty in this realm. Political economy as a science in the German sense has to be yet created, and for that purpose there will be required not only we two but a whole dozen of people." (Marx to Lassalle, Nov. 12, 1858. XXV, R. 232-3). This pretense was dropped by Marx after Lassalle's death. In the preface to *Capital* he declared in a positive manner that "Lassalle has borrowed almost literally from my writings, and without any acknowledgment, all the general theoretical propositions in his economic works." And Engels sharply announced: "I'll have to put an end to the illusion that Lassalle in the economic realm (and in all the others) was supposedly an original thinker." (Letter to Bernstein, Sept. 22, 1888)

2. *Marx and Marriage*

In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels vented their contempt for bourgeois marriage with its cash calculations—"The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

reduced the family relations to a mere money relations." Such relations, they stated, were foreign to the worker and his family: "The proletarian is without property; his relation to his wife and children has no longer anything in common with the bourgeois family relations."

But the official contempt Engels and Marx displayed for the money-relations of the bourgeois family was just as their pretense at democratic convictions. Like the proletarian, Marx was without property. And one would assume, judging by his publicly-expressed canon, that his views on marriage excluded any thought of money but were concerned with the nobility of affection. Yet when Lafargue courted Marx's daughter, Laura, Marx weighed the affair, not on the ground of how deep was the young couple's love, but on how well Lafargue was situated *economically!* Quite dictatorially Marx insisted that the love affair could not go on until he knew definitely how much Lafargue was worth in exchange value: "Today I wrote Lafargue a long letter in French, informing him that before continuing this business or bringing it to a conclusion, I must have from his family positive information regarding his economic status." (Marx to Engels, Aug. 13, 1866. XXIII, R. 376)

3. *Some Facts Behind Das Kapital*

A person who spent a lifetime as an ideological prisoner of the Marxist burocrats will exclaim: But what of *Capital?* Is it possible that Marx conceived and executed this gigantic work in any other spirit than that of a proletarian teacher whose principal concern, at least in this instance, was for the oppressed and exploited? The answer is to be found in *facts* not in the ignorant or consciously hypocritical hymn to Marx. Since *Capital,* as Marx points out in the preface to the first volume of that work, represented the continuation of his earlier book, the *Critique of Political Economy,* a fuller view of Marx's real attitude towards his basic scientific labors will be provided if we examine it in relation to these two books.

Discussing Marx's future arrangements with the publisher who was to bring out the *Critique,* Engels made certain "revolutionary" suggestions. He proposed that Marx counter the publisher's attempt to reduce the amount of royalty for each *sheet* of sixteen pages by artificially inflating the size of his book with excerpts from various economists, historians, and other writers. The citations, Engels pointed out, would cost Marx nothing, yet he would sell them to the publishers: "For every louis d'or which he takes away from you per sheet, you will force him to take as many extra sheets as necessary to make up the same general sum, and you fill in these extra sheets with citations, etc., which cost you nothing. 20 sheets at 3 pounds or 30 sheets at 2 pounds always make 60 pound sterling. And indeed it is quite easy to fill 10 sheets with quotations, without cost and loss of time,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

from Petty, Steward, Colepepper and other authors, and, incidentally, your book will become more 'educational.' " (Letter to Marx, Nov. 27, 1851, XXI, R. 298)

The real intent behind this was not merely to secure more money but to stage a spectacular, dramatic appearance on the bourgeois literary and scientific stage with a *fat* volume. This, Engels wrote, was of the utmost importance! "Most important, it is necessary that you again make your debut before the public with a fat book, and it is best that it contain the most innocent matter, history." *(Ib.)*

Such was the cynical approach of these men to their own scientific labors! A proletarian burocrat will often produce elaborate and magnificent theoretical works of immense educational value to the workers. But the purpose he has in mind is altogether different from the one implicit in the contents of his product. The intention behind Marx's greatest work *Das Kapital* was not to enlighten the workers but to make a display of his encyclopedic erudition, to show off, to make a big hit with the "public." The German "public" valued a book not for its ideas but for its size, Marx stated, so he was very obliging in this respect. While working on the first volume of *Capital,* he informed Engels: "I am greatly enlarging the volume since the German dogs measure the value of a book by its cubic dimensions." (June 18, 1862. XXIII, R. 81)

Under the term "German dogs" Marx did not mean the workers but the learned men of the bourgeois public. It was for their acclaim that Marx was bidding. After the publication of the first volume of *Capital,* Engels, in a review of the work, showed that Marx was presenting his views to the bourgeois economists: "This time Marx addresses his extraordinary propositions not to the masses but to the men of science." (XIII, Pt. I, R. 218)

Since Marx was addressing the book to the learned men of the bourgeoisie, he did everything to make it pretentious and verbose. The manner in which he conveyed extremely valuable scientific propositions, in themselves entirely accessible to the intelligent worker, put them out of reach of the proletarian ranks. Ironically, as it turned out, the ponderous, dry, involved execution made it virtually impossible for even the highly learned bourgeois scholars and intellectual luminaries to master *Capital.* At first Marx was very angry with the "German dogs" for their disapproval of the heavy style. But later Engels recalled that Marx was much amused when professor Schaffle, after studying *Capital* for ten years, complained of his inability to understand the work. (Engels to Schlegeman, March 26, 1885)

But this is not all. Marx and Engels had resolved to win recognition from the German bourgeois men of learning and they set out to gain their end by stratagem. Upon the appearance of *Capital* Engels proposed to write up anonymous reviews of the work "from the bourgeois view-point in order to move the matter forward." (Letter to Marx, Sept. 11, 1867). In one such review Engels, in order to stimu-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

late interest in the book, attacked *Capital* and hypocritically rejected as fantasy Marx's conclusion that the capitalist system would come to an end: "If space permitted, it would be possible to show that these subjective fantasies of his are refuted by his own objective presentation." *(Der Beobachter,* Dec. 27, 1867; XIII, Pt. 1, R. 222)

But matters did not stop there. Marx and Engels approached the problem also from an altogether different angle and *offered the work to the German capitalists!* Engels asked the German exploiters to accept *Capital,* to go deeply into its scientific and educational content, to recognize in *Capital* a source of knowledge which could be employed by the German capitalists against their British competitors. He assured the German manufacturers that in certain portions of *Capital* Marx had rendered a service to German capitalist industry. Engels realized that the German bourgeoise was prejudiced against writers who professed to oppose its interests. But he handled this delicate point gently. He reassuringly urged the manufacturers to disregard the anti-capitalist tone of *Capital.* The Germans were divided politically, Engels admitted, but, he hinted broadly, they were all united as *Germans.*

"Those German business men who regard their industry not only from the point of view of every-day profit but as an essential link in the entire great contemporary industrial development of all countries and who therefore are interested also in matters not directly connected with their field, will find here a rich and edifying source and will be thankful to us for our calling their attention to it. . . . A greater education which up to now has been saving us Germans, despite our political divisions, would be also in this instance the best weapon which we could direct against the crudely-materialistic English . . . the author has rendered a great service to German industry in that he has given the history of the English legislation and its results in the most detailed manner on the basis of official documents (see pages 207-281, 399, 496 and further in various places). . . . We are calling upon our manufacturers not to be frightened by the tendency of the book and seriously study this part of it in particular; sooner or later this very question will undoubtedly arise before them." *(Gewerberblatt aus Wurthemberg,* Dec. 27, 1867; XIII, Pt. 1, R. 224-6)

Had the workers learned of this contemptible prostitution of *Capital* by the "founders of scientific Socialism" there would have been a scandal of the first magnitude. Foreseeing the danger, Engels published the above appeal to the German manufacturers anonymously. The Stalinist researchers copied it not from the journal where it was originally printed but from Engels' manuscript.

The German manufacturers did not choose to give *Capital* official publicity but there are signs that privately some of them gave attention to it, finding in its pages a wealth of important information which could be effectively used to serve German capitalism. Three months after Engels' prostitute appeal to the German factory owners was pub-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lished Marx received a letter from the petty-bourgeois poet Freiligrath who had been one of his close associates in the 1848 days as a member of the editorial staff of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. The letter described the reception *Capital* got among the Rhenish capitalists:

"I know that in the Rhineland many young merchants and factory owners are enthusiastic about the book. In these circles it will accomplish its real purpose—and will in addition be an indispensable source of reference for the man of learning." (Cited by Marx in *Letters to Kugelmann*, 69)

Marx made small efforts in the International to have its proletarian members study *Capital* because he knew that the book was unintelligible to the workers. For a moment Engels considered the question of putting into simple terms the scientific propositions of the book. A year after the publication of *Capital*, on September 16, 1868, Engels wrote to Marx: "The question is: does it not seem urgently necessary to have a popular, brief presentation of the contents of your book for the workers?" This, of course, could have been done in the first place if Marx and his alter ego had not been prompted by other motives. However, Marx and Engels never translated *Capital* into understandable working class language. On the other hand, Marx gave up much of his time helping to prepare a French translation of the work as it was. To the French workers, too, *Capital* was unintelligible as can be gathered from a remark by Engels: "The French translation of *Capital* is a closed book to them and not only to them alone but also to the educated elements." (Letter to Bebel, October 28, 1885)

Marx, of course, was fully aware that he had interspersed his book with incomprehensible expressions. In a letter to Kugelmann, dated November 30, 1867 Marx told him how to have Frau Kugelmann study the work: "You will have to give explanations of incomprehensible terms. On any other doubtful points, I am at your service." Engels had to send instructions on how to tackle *Capital* even to Victor Adler, the founder of Austrian Social Democracy. (Letter, March 16, 1895)

The Marxist burocrats of all countries have been shamelessly lying that Marx's style in *Capital* was so simple that it was a delight to the reader. The German Marxists added a proud nationalist touch to their praise of Marx's coinage of expressions which were actually an obstacle to the workers. "But what an infinite wealth of original, genuine German word formations and word constructions we find in Marx who in spite of the fact that two-thirds of his life were passed abroad, performed very high services for our German language and belongs to the most eminent masters and creators of the German language." (Wilhelm Liebknecht, *From Reminiscences of Marx*)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Political Chameleons*

A good illustration of political insincerity of Marx and Engels is the case of Ernest Jones, originally a Chartist, later a Right reformist. Jones manifested his servility to the British bourgeoisie in such a crass fashion as to call the bourgeois leader Gladstone "that great leader of the working classes." Marx compared Jones to a general who on the day of battle goes over to the enemy. "The harm he has done the English proletariat is enormous." (Letter to Weydemeyer, Feb. 1, 1859, *Sel. Cor.* 116). Writing to Engels, Marx expressed his opinion of Jones' politics: "Our friend Jones has decidedly sold himself (but at the lowest possible price) to the Bright Coterie." (Sept. 21, 1858. XXII, R. 358). Engels replied: "The story with Jones is revolting." (Oct. 7, 1858. *Ib.* 360). Engels described Ernest Jones "as an obedient servant of Bright and Gladstone." (Letter to Marx, Nov. 13, 1868. XXIV, R. 128)

Jones in his election campaign against a Liberal banker Langly came to Marx for aid. Marx refused, and the reasons he listed throw a revealing light on the nature of Marx's politics: "Regarding Ernest Jones, I find him exceedingly cool. I should come out in the role of his electioneering agent (for Greenwich!). I told him I don't see even a ghost of a chance for him.

"1) The local candidate is banker Langly, and neither the candidacy of Mill nor of Beals could stand without his permission.

"2) The General Council of the International does not intervene in the electoral struggle. And certainly under no circumstances can we come out *against* the banker Langly, since—and this corresponds to fact—banker Langly and his *Sunday* League concluded with us a friendly pact after the Brussels Congress. (Indeed, our sessions are taking place in their quarters)." (Letter to Engels, Nov. 20, 1868)

Engels' reply to Marx on Jones is as follows: "Jones is cool indeed, and in all respects behaved without reckoning with the host. He will hardly find a spot where he can be elected. Liberals of his calibre are galore and plenty since he identified himself with this breed." (Nov. 25, 1868. XXIV, R. 135)

Two months after Engels wrote this, Jones died and his death caused Marx and Engels to execute a fantastic political change of heart. Of a sudden Engels decided that if Jones was a hypocrite he was one in an odd way: in dosing the workers for many years with capitalist propaganda Jones hadn't really been sincere; inwardly he had been against the capitalists; therefore, Engels concluded from this twisted premise, Jones' death was a *loss* to the workers! In a letter to Marx dated January 29, 1869 Engels said: "Tomorrow, with an enormous procession, Jones is to be buried in the same churchyard where Lupus lies. The fellow is really a loss. His bourgeois phrases were only hypocrisy after all, and here in Manchester there is no one who can take his place with the workers. They will become completely disin-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tegrated again and fall right into the net of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, he was the only *educated* Englishman among the politicians who was, at bottom, entirely on our side." *(Sel. Cor.* 116)

It was of importance to the British reactionary labor leaders to keep the memory of the bourgeois politics of Jones alive in the mind of the workers. In March 1869 they organized a memorial meeting for Jones and collected money to finance the affair. One of the contributors was Marx.

5. *Marx's Sham Speech on Free Trade*

On January 9, 1848 Marx delivered his well-known Speech on Free Trade to the Democratic Association in Brussels. In the speech Marx declared for the principle of free trade:

"Generally speaking, the protectionist system is today conservative, while the system of free trade acts destructively. It decomposes the old nationalities and pushes the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie to the extreme limits. In a word, the system of free trade accelerates the social revolution. And only in this, revolutionary sense, gentlemen, do I stand for free trade." (V. R., 461; Appendix to *Poverty of Philosophy* by Marx, *Marxist Library,* XXVI, 208). Any one who accepts Marx's word as the gospel believes that this is actually Marx's position on free trade, and is therefore convinced that this is the correct policy for the proletariat to follow. However, Engels, fortunately, left conclusive documentary evidence on Marx's "stand for free trade" which exposes the burocratic arrogance and anti-working class political corruption of these two men. The evidence was penned by Engels through sheer "accident" in correspondence with Schleuter, one of Marx's German disciples who had emigrated to the United States.

Schleuter and other Marxists in America wanted to translate Marx's speech into English and distribute it among the American workers. Schleuter wrote to Engels making some inquiries. In reply Engels revealed that the speech had been Marx's part in a sham polemic he and Engels had secretly arranged and then conducted before a duped audience. Engels' role in this fake performance had been to defend the protective tariff. In his letter to Schleuter dated January 29, 1891, Engels wrote:

"Tell me something more definite about the mentioned speech of Marx on protective tariff. I only remember that when in the Brussels German Workers Association the discussions lost animation, Marx and I arranged to conduct a sham polemic in which he would defend free trade and I protective tariff. I see before my eyes the astounded faces of those present when they saw us fall upon each other. Possibly, this speech was published in *Deutsche Brusseler Zeitung.* I don't remember any other speech." (XXVIII, R. 280)

And in fact there is no other speech by Marx on the question of Free Trade. Had it not been for this purely accidental revelation no

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

one would ever have known the truth about Marx's Speech on Free Trade. Did Schleuter disclose the amazing secret to his American colleagues? At any rate they all proceeded with the publication of the Speech. One of them, Florence Kelly-Wishnewetsky, who translated it, asked Engels to write an introduction. And Engels, fully conscious of the burlesque origin of the Speech, wrote an introduction presenting the Speech as a profound diagnosis of free trade as it affected the cause of the proletariat.

On the strength of the evidence furnished by Engels himself in his letter to Schleuter, it is clear that Marx and Engels viewed the proletariat with burocratic contempt and had no qualms about causing deliberate confusion among the workers through spurious discussions.

The pretended dispute on the issue of Free Trade, besides being an imposition on the credulous audience, had another, equally if not more damning, aspect. The two speakers were recognized to have been well equipped to present the subject, and some listeners, no doubt, sided with Marx while others accepted the view "defended" by Engels. What the audience did not know, in addition to the fact that the whole fight was a farce performance, was that neither Marx nor Engels defended a correct, proletarian position and that both consciously deceived their listeners on this score too. Only a little over two years before, Marx and Engels had stated quite plainly: "We absolutely do not intend to defend either protective tariff or free trade, but wish to give a criticism of both systems from our point of view. Our point of view is a Communist one." (Engels to Kampe, Oct. 14, 1845. XXV, R. 8)

Several weeks after Marx put up his sham defense of free trade he and Engels published the *Communist Manifesto*. What were their private, subjective, designs behind this work? The motive behind the fake debate was to enliven the audience, or more accurately, to stimulate respect for Marx and Engels as pre-eminent experts on the issue of free trade. We have seen that in the case of the *Critique of Political Economy* they padded the work secretly, partly for pecuniary reasons, but mainly to sell Marx to the "public," and in the case of Marx's greatest study, *Das Kapital,* they enlarged the text to impress the "German dogs." It is logical to suspect that in everyone of their works they were guided only by their personal burocratic ambitions.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER VI.

MARX'S GERMAN-NATIONALIST POLICY IN THE FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR

1. *Bismarck's "Defensive" War*

On July 19, 1870 the Franco-Prussian War broke out. Bonaparte sought a military victory to stabilize his power at home and to enhance his prestige abroad. Bismarck, on his part, had been preparing this War for some years. Prussia, after defeating Austria in the struggle for leadership of the lesser German States (1866) faced a serious obstacle in unifying them under its domination in Bonaparte's opposition to the emergence of a powerful German neighbor. The only solution for the German bourgeoisie was war against France.

The correct proletarian position as against these monarchist-bourgeois perspectives would have been to call upon the workers of both warring camps to utilize the crisis for the removal of both Bonaparte and Bismarck, to carry out the slogan "Workers of all countries unite." Marx and Engels, however, saw an opportunity to apply, not some of the theoretical postulates of the *Communist Manifesto,* but the German-military plans Engels had outlined in his works *Po and Rhine* and *Nice, Savoy and Rhine.*

Marx, in London, was elated by the prospect of Prussian victory. He saw that it would correspondingly lift the German working class above the rest of the world proletarian movement and therefore, logically, would raise Engels and himself high above Proudhon, Blanqui and Bakunin. On the second day of the War, July 20, 1870, Marx in a private message to Engels presented his alluring perspective:

"The French need a thrashing. If the Prussians win, the centralization of the state power will be useful for the centralization of the German working class. German predominance would also transfer the centre of gravity of the workers' movement in Western Europe from France to Germany, and one has only to compare the movement in the two countries from 1866 till now to see that the German working class is superior to the French both theoretically and organizationally. Their predominance over the French on the world stage would also mean the predominance of *our* theory over Proudhon's etc." *(Sel. Cor.* 292). Thus, having failed to establish his hegemony in the world proletarian movement by means of theoretical weapons in the field of polemics, Marx now hoped to gain this hegemony through the vicarious use of military weapons on the field of battle—in the form of von Moltke's Army.

In Germany itself the two national proletarian organizations, the Marxist Social-Democratic Workers' Party of Germany, (formed by Liebknecht and Bebel in August 1869), and the General Association of German Workers (Ferdinand Lassalle, May 1863) answered Bismarck's appeal for popular support in various ways. On July 21, 1870

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

when the North German Reichstag voted war credits, the Lassallean representatives responded with unconditional patriotic support. Liebknecht and Bebel, on the other hand, abstained from voting and made a declaration which stated in part, "We *cannot grant* the financial resources demanded by the Reichstag for the conduct of the war, because this would be a vote of confidence in the Prussian Government, which prepared the present war by its course of action in 1866. It is equally impossible for us to refuse the money demanded, for this might be taken as a justification of the vicious and criminal policy of Bonaparte." The essence of this "neutral" stand was that they could not definitely refuse Bismarck his demand for war appropriations. In contrast to this "proletarian" line, virtually at the same moment, in the French Chamber the Liberal bourgeois deputies voted *against* credits, and even Thiers, the future butcher of the Commune, manifested opposition to the war.

On July 23 the General Council of the International issued an Address on the War drawn up by Marx *(S. W.* II, 461). In it he flayed both Louis Bonaparte and Bismarck but the political German-patriotic substance of his stand was: "On the German side, the war is a war of defense."

Meanwhile the "neutral" line taken by Liebknecht and Bebel met with vigorous patriotic opposition from the Brunswick Committee, the Central Committee of the Marxist German Social Democratic Sections. On the 24 of July 1870 it issued a pro-German proclamation which ended with the words "Long live Germany! Long live the International Struggle of the proletariat!" (Guillaume, *Documents,* II, 70). Called upon to settle the dispute between the Brunswick Committee and Liebknecht and Bebel, Marx turned to Engels for advice. Engels in his reply blurted out the plain truth that the Social-Democratic Workers Party was a *German* political organization. Glowing with the noble fire of the "furor teutonicus," or in simpler terms, enthusiastic over the fact that the German working class was drugged with nationalism and was politically fused with the Prussian aristocracy and the German bourgeoisie, and was butchering the French masses on the battlefields instead of fraternizing with them against both the German and the French oppressors, Engels attacked the position of Liebknecht and Bebel: "The whole mass of the German people of every class have realized that this is first and foremost a question of national existence and have therefore at once flung themselves into it. That in these circumstances a German political party should preach total obstruction *a la* Wilhelm (Liebknecht) and place all sorts of secondary considerations, seems to me impossible." *(Sel. Cor.* 295)

Apropos of this line of Engels', an interesting sidelight: Lenin in the War of 1914, to fit history into his own scheme of things, distorted the attitude Engels had assumed towards Bebel and Liebknecht in the Franco-Prussian War: "Even at the beginning of the War of 1870-1871 Marx and Engels *approved* Bebel's and Liebknecht's refusal to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

vote for military appropriations." ("Socialism and War," *C. W.* XVIII, 228)

Having denounced Liebknecht for obstructing Bismarck's war policy Engels turned his "furor teutonicus" upon French Chauvinism. He knew, of course, that the task of destroying French as well as all other chauvinism could be carried out only by the proletarian revolution. But this revolution was a remote abstraction, while the lusty Prussian Army was a hard reality. Therefore Prussian chauvinist Bismarck would teach French chauvinism a lesson to remember: "Until this chauvinism is knocked on the head, and that properly, peace between Germany and France is impossible. One might have expected that a proletarian revolution would have undertaken this work, but since the war is already there, nothing remains for the Germans but to do it themselves and quickly." *(Sel. Cor.* 295-6)

Unquestionably Engels perceived that the guilt for the war rested on both Bonaparte and Bismarck. But out of his German chauvinism he was anxious to have the war appear as Bonapartist aggression. He wrote to Marx: "It is a good thing that the French were the first to invade German territory. When the Germans follow on the heels of a repelled invasion this, undoubtedly, creates an altogether different impression in France than if they were to enter France without a prior invasion. Thanks to this the war appears more Bonapartist on the side of France." (July 31, 1870. XXIV, R. 365)

Following the war situation closely, Engels was elated when von Moltke's Army surged toward the French frontier and in the first skirmishes "we" Germans were victorious: "My confidence in the military strategy of the Germans is growing stronger daily. And so, *we* have indeed won the first serious battle." (364. Our emph.—G. S.). Delighted with the Prussian victory at Weissenburg, Engels on August 5, 1870 in a letter to Marx, was rapturous over the valor of Bismarck's troops: "But what do you say about our soldiers who take a fortified position with bayonets against mitrailleuses and magazine rifles? Molodets! (brave fellows—G. S.)" (373)

2. *Anxiety for Germany's Future*

On September 2, 1870 the whole French army at Sedan together with Louis Bonaparte was captured and von Moltke marched on Paris. The Junkers, delirious with joy, and the German beer patriots whose robber predilections were at a fever pitch, demanded the seizure of Alsace and Lorraine. Exalted as Marx and Engels undoubtedly were at the stirring triumph of brilliant German generalship, German morale and invincible German military might, they looked ahead and clearly discerned in the annexation of the two French provinces a terrible future threat to their beloved fatherland. The French bourgeoisie, seeking revenge, would inevitably, almost automatically, conclude an alliance with the Tsar who would be compelled to accept it

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

or face alone the new continental power. Two weeks before Sedan Marx had said to Engels: "The lust for Alsace and Lorraine seems to predominate in two circles, the Prussian cammarilla and the South German beer-patriots. It would be the greatest misfortune which could befall Europe and above all Germany. You will have seen that most of the Russian newspapers are already talking of the necessity of European diplomatic intervention in order to maintain the balance of power in Europe." *(Sel. Cor.* 299)

Marx and Engels, of course, wanted a war with Russia, but not a simultaneous struggle on two fronts against great odds. On September 9, 1870 the General Council of the International issued a second Address on the War. The document did not contain a single proletarian-internationalist phrase. It merely argued Marx's sober patriotic position against the unthinking German beer-patriots: "Do the Teuton patriots really believe that liberty and peace will be guaranteed to Germany by forcing France into the arms of Russia?" ("Second Address of the General Council on the Franco-Prussian War," *S. W.* II, 471)

In their expression of German patriotic sentiments Marx and Engels again evinced a phenomenal lapse of memory regarding correct proletarian views. They had written in the *Communist Manifesto:* "Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—bourgeoisie and proletariat." But the security of Germany's future demanded that the true sons of the Fatherland implant in the mind of the proletariat the illusion of a totally different division in society. In the Address Marx approvingly cited a manifesto issued by the leaders of the German Socialist-Democratic Workmen's Party: " 'We,' they say, 'We protest against the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. And we are conscious of speaking in the name of the German working class. In the common interest of France and Germany, in the interest of *Western civilization* against *eastern barbarism* the German workmen will not patiently tolerate the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine." (472.—Our emph.—G. S.)

Thus the cleavage in modern society suddenly ran not on *class* lines, according to the leaders of the German Party, but on the invented lines of *east* and *west,* "barbarism" and "civilization." This was a frontal attack on the correct ideas put forth in the *Communist Manifesto.* Who prompted this Liberal-bourgeois Manifesto of the German Socialist leaders? The answer is given in a footnote by the Stalinist editor of Marx's works: "The basis for this manifesto was Marx's letter of instructions to the committee of the German Social Democratic Party." *(Ib.).* In this letter, dated September 1, 1870 (XXVI, R. 69), Marx warned the leaders of German Social Democracy: "If they seize Alsace-Lorraine then France *and* Russia will fight against Germany." Marx felt it his national duty to secure for Germany a safe western frontier in a future war against Russia, and the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

only guarantee in his estimation was "an honorable peace for France." But the Prussian nobility and the South German patriots disregarded his demand which, as history proved, was a stroke of genius. Twenty years later Engels exclaimed with an air of I-told-you-so: "Has not the annexation of the French provinces driven France into the arms of Russia?" (Introduction to Marx's *Civil War in France, S. W.* II, 447)

The alliance of the western bourgeois-democratic "civilized" France with the Tsar gave the lie to the idea approved by Marx that the line-up was "western civilization against eastern barbarism." In 1878, exactly eight years after he had supported this non-existing division, Marx executed another feat in the realm of theoretical fabrications. He divided "eastern barbarism," siding with the Sultan against the Tsar and thus inadvertently admitting that all these divisions were political swindles, and that the only correct theoretical view of division was the one presented in the *Communist Manifesto*.

CHAPTER VII.

MARX AND ENGELS BETRAY THE PROLETARIAT DURING THE PARIS COMMUNE

1. *Marx's Policy After Sedan: Stabilization of the Trochu-Thiers Regime*

THE MILITARY collapse of the Bonapartist regime took the French working class completely by surprise; but the French bourgeoisie acted swiftly and decisively in the governmental crisis. A group of monarchist and Right republican deputies in a move recorded by the bourgeois historians as "the revolution of the 4th of September 1870" established a provisional government under the presidency of General Trochu, the military governor of Paris, with Thiers as "the secret prompter of the government" (Marx). The Trochu regime was formed in the midst of the greatest proletarian threat bourgeois society had ever faced. The national disaster in the most advanced capitalist country on the Continent was but a prelude to proletarian revolution, which could succeed or fail dependent, above all else, on the political guidance furnished to the working class. Correct strategy and an *honest* leadership were the imperative needs of the hour.

In the International two widely divergent lines crystallized immediately after Sedan, a drastic ulra-Left and an extreme ultra-Right. Adopting an ultra-Left policy, Bakuninists, Proudhonists and petty-bourgeois Jacobins, politically representing a poor caricature of the proletarian leadership, rushed to France. The French proletariat was but just awakening amidst the astounding developments. Even the workers of Paris were not yet fully conscious of what was happening. At this point, without any organized program and making no effort to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

coordinate their activities with the International, Bakunin and a small band of his Anarchists seized the city hall of Lyons (September 28, 1870). They held it for a few hours, issued a decree "abolishing" the State, and when the crowd in the streets, gaping in amazement, failed to support them against the gendarmes of the Republic, they fled to Switzerland.

Marx presented his position on the situation in France to the General Council on September 6, 1870, and having secured approval drew up in the name of the International the second Address on the War. This document is the one to which we referred in which Marx substituted the fabrication about "interest of western civilization against eastern barbarism" for the idea of the class struggle. On the seething French situation Marx developed the line he had originated in the Revolution of 1848, the "double" line of "critical" support to the enemies of the workers: "We hail the advent of the republic in France, but at the same time we labor under misgivings which we hope (!?!—G. S.) will prove groundless. That republic has not subverted the throne, but only taken its place become vacant. It has been proclaimed, not as a social conquest, but as a national measure of defense. It is in the hands of a Provisional Government composed partly of notorious Orleanists, partly of middle class republicans, upon some of whom the insurrection of June 1848 has left its indelible stigma." (*S. W.* II, 472-3)

Marx *"hoped"* everything would work out well for the proletariat, but meanwhile he was tying the French masses to their exploiters. That he knew what he was doing is obvious because it was impossible for him to harbor any illusions regarding the function of the Trochu-Thiers regime. Twenty-two years before the formation of this bourgeois regime Marx had declared in clear words in the *Communist Manifesto* "The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie." Moreover, Marx knew that some of the officials of this new executive committee of the French bourgeoisie had on their hands the blood of the workers butchered in June 1848! With this knowledge in mind Marx still urged the workers to support their former and future hangmen!

In the Address Marx swept away *class* ideology and instructed the French workers to behave as "citizens" of the new bourgeois republic: "The French working class moves, therefore, under circumstances of extreme difficulty. Any attempt at upsetting the new government in the present crisis, when the enemy is almost knocking at the doors of Paris, would be a desperate folly. The French workmen must perform their duties as citizens; but at the same time, they must not allow themselves to be swayed by the national *souvenirs* of 1792, as the French peasants allowed themselves to be deluded by the national *souvenirs* of the First Empire." (473-4). Pursuing the policy of support to the Trochu-Thiers regime, Marx informed the international proletariat that "The English workmen have already taken measures to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

overcome by a wholesome pressure from without, the reluctance of their government to recognize the French republic." Consistently enough, the Address concluded not with the slogan for proletarian revolution but with the bourgeois cry in French: *"Vive la Republique!"* (475)

Privately Marx and Engels held a very contemptuous opinion of the Republic which they told the workers to support. On September 7, 1870, two days before Marx issued the Address, Engels had written to him: "This whole Republic, including its peaceful birth, up to now represents the purest farce." (XXIV, R. 395). "It is characteristic of the lousy Paris Government that it does not have the courage to tell the public the truth about the situation." (396). Three days after Marx's Address declared "We hail the advent of the republic" Engels referred to it as "the present lousy republic."

Marx was extremely active in the working class movement in behalf of the regime of General Trochu (September 1870-1871): "I have set everything in motion here so that the workers (a series of meetings will open up on Monday) should compel their government to recognize the French Republic. Gladstone at first was willing enough. But the *Queen* who is under the influence of Prussian instructions and the oligarch portion of the Cabinet are against." (Letter to Engels, Sept. 10, 1870. XXIV, R. 398)

A great meeting was held in St. James Hall in London, sponsored by the General Council. The meeting passed a resolution demanding recognition of Trochu's "Government of National Defense" and an "honorable" peace for the French Republic. On January 23, 1871 the International led a mass demonstration in Trafalgar Square. The workers carried the French bourgeois tricolor and shouted *"Vive La Republique!"* Marx's active hand in bolstering the Republic and tying the French workers to swindlers and monarchists headed by Trochu and Thiers bore fruit: "This address met with a lively echo amongst the French workers, who abandoned their struggle against the provisional government and did their duty as citizens, particularly the proletariat of Paris . . ." (Mehring, 470)

2. *Pertinent Questions*

What private motive prompted Marx to bind the French proletariat to the "lousy Republic" factually led by Thiers? Why didn't he adhere to the letter and spirit of the theoretical aspects of the *Communist Manifesto* and advocate the organization of the French proletariat for the seizure of power? Was there any hidden meaning in the words Engels wrote to Marx on September 12, 1870: "However the peace may turn out, it must be concluded before the workers can do anything at all"?

Let us attempt to answer these questions. Supposing the International instead of tying the French workers to the bourgeois State

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

had taken a line of overthrowing the French bourgeoisie. If crowned with success, a national patriotic mass tempest would have swept France, followed by a mighty French-proletarian-peasant war against the German invaders. The spirit of 1792, when nearly the whole population of France rose up to the cry of *La Patrie en Danger* and under the stirring strains of the Marseillaise drove the invading Prussians back, was political dynamite. Marx understood that, heated to fury, this spirit would carry the French national proletarian army half-way across Europe, and Marx's fatherland, as during the French Revolutionary Wars, would again become submerged in the French tide. Unquestionably that's what Marx had in mind when he urged the French workers "not to allow themselves to be swayed by the national *souvenirs* of 1792." Already there were signs in France, despite sabotage by the National Government of Defense, of growing resistance to the invaders. New army corps were formed with great rapidity and were assembled on the Loire. A sudden guerrilla "Fog of War," conducted with astonishing patriotic fervor and self-sacrifice by volunteers, franc-tireurs, and unorganized armed workers and peasants, enveloped portions of the Prussian army. At Coulmiers—over two months after Sedan —the Germans suffered a severe military defeat (November 9, 1870); at Paris they were being defeated morally by the huge forces of the Workers National Guard.

3. *The Proletariat of Paris Rises*

On the morning of March 18, 1871 the workers of Paris discarded the slogan "Vive la Republique" with which Marx had suggestively concluded the Address of September 9, 1870. The air reverberated with a different slogan: "Vive la Commune!"

In a careful, measured way the Government of National Defense had pursued its policy of demonstrating that there was no sense in resisting the German Army. Capitulating to Bismarck on the 28 of January 1871 it officially surrendered Paris, compelling a force of nearly 400,000 well-armed men to yield to the besieging troops numbering only 240,000. In the terms of the capitulation, however, neither the victors nor the vanquished dared to stipulate the disarming of the 300,000 workers of the Paris National Guard.

While the armistice in February enabled the French bourgeoisie to manipulate a rapid election to the National Assembly and reorganize its government with Thiers as the chief executive, the armed proletariat of Paris caused unparalleled anxiety. The bourgeoisie remembered well the uprising of June 1848. The crisis was heightened by Bismarck's reluctance to act. His troops entered the city on March 1, 1871, but finding the workers' guns bristling soon withdrew to avoid a battle and possible embarrassment of defeat. The atmosphere was charged. Thiers decided upon direct action and sent 6,000 regular troops at night to seize the cannon belonging to the National Guard.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The attempt met with resistance and his soldiers, refusing to fire on the workers, arrested their own officers. The insurrection swept over the city, and, panick-stricken, the government fled to Versailles, followed by its police and officials and the cream of the bourgeoisie. Armed workers took control of Paris. The Central Committee of the National Guard conducted elections on the 26 of March, and immediately turned power over to the newly-elected Council of the Commune.

Unquestionably, the proletarian upheaval of March 18, 1871 was one of the most significant events in the history of capitalist society. It is now pertinent to inquire: What was Marx's response to the March 18 uprising and to the proclamation of the Commune?

4. *Marx's Queer Silence*

When the proletariat seized the capital of France, at that time the pride and glory not only of the French but of the international bourgeoisie, with a population second only to London, *Marx was silent!* We recall that at the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, Marx within three days produced an appeal "To the Members of the International Working Men's Association in Europe and the United States," calling for support to Germany. Similarly, when the Trochu-Thiers regime came to the helm, Marx immediately presented his position and buttressed this bourgeois regime with the official Address of the International and the cry *"Vive la Republique!"* Now, however, *Marx was silent.* Days went by, the keener minds in Europe and across the seas were stirred in warm sympathy or unconcealed hostility toward the Paris uprising, but Marx presented *no position.*

When the Paris revolution was well into the second week, an uneasiness became manifest among the members of the General Council of the International who were accustomed to Marx's political guidance. Why was Marx delaying a statement of his policy on the Paris Commune? On the 28 of March, ten days after the uprising, the General Council adopted a decision instructing Marx to write an Address to the masses of Paris hailing the Commune. But Marx continued his tactic of evasion. Weeks were passing, the leaders of the Commune were committing colossal blunders, letting obvious advantages slip through their fingers and piloting the whole enterprise along a disastrous route. Marx was silent, but not because of an innate reticence. He was, indeed, a most prolific speaker and writer. And so was Engels for that matter. And their works clearly show them to be people who invariably strove to be not only abreast of the times but in advance of them—in all situations, *except during the Paris Commune!*

The world proletariat had no other political guidance save the International, and the International had no other people as capable as Marx and Engels. The revolutionary workers in all advanced countries awaited a word of enlightenment from the International. It

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

would have taken Marx, or Engels, perhaps three hours or maybe a day to draw up a suitable document. But weeks were dragging on and no official document was issued.

5. *Marx on the Art of Insurrection*

At Versailles the bourgeois leaders were energetically assembling a force to crush the workers of Paris. The task of raising and organizing an adequate army was not easy. Following the surrender to Bismarck, most of the regular troops had been disbanded; a large French army was interned in Switzerland, and the few regiments Bismarck allowed Thiers were of doubtful loyalty. "On the 19th March, what remained to M. Thiers wherewith to govern France? He had neither an army, nor cannon, nor the large towns. These possessed arms, and their workmen were on the alert." (Lissagaray, *History of the Commune of 1871,* 271). Indeed, Thiers would have been unable to defend Versailles *itself* if the Central Committee of the Paris National Guard, instead of acting like a flock of sitting ducks, had led a number of battalions in pursuit of the fugitive government. As Marx later wrote in the *Civil War in France:* "In their reluctance to continue the civil war opened by Thiers' burglarous attempt on Montmartre, the Central Committee made themselves, this time, guilty of a decisive mistake in not at once marching upon Versailles, then completely helpless, and thus putting an end to the conspiracies of Thiers and his Rurals." *(S.W.* II, 492)

Overthrown in Paris, Thiers found no enthusiastic support in the provinces except among the wealthy landlords. In the larger towns the workers joyously echoed the proletarian rising in Paris and taking heart from this example they set up Communes in Lyons, St. Etienne, Creuzot, Marseilles, Toulouse and Narbonne. But the movement petered out for want of positive political guidance and because Paris did not move against Thiers at Versailles.

The fate of Versailles hinged on the negligence and political worthlessness of the leaders of the Commune, on their peaceable attitude and the policy of holding their military forces within the bounds of Paris and thus of transforming the workers' great strength into a great weakness. Of paramount value to the momentarily distressed bourgeoisie was the fact that Marx and Engels, who knew exactly what strategy the Commune had to pursue to become master of France, kept quiet. Nearly two decades earlier, in *Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution,* Marx had written: "But in revolution as in war, it is always necessary to show a strong front, and he who attacks is in the advantage." (116). Marx had pointed out that uprising is an art, that revolution can succeed only by the strategy of immediate offensive:

"The defensive is the death of every armed rising; it is lost before it measures itself with its enemies. Surprise your antagonists while their forces are scattering, prepare new successes, however small, but

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

daily; keep up the moral ascendant which the first successful rising has given to you; rally thus those vacillating elements to your side which always follow the strongest impulse and which always look out for the safer side; force your enemies to a retreat before they can collect their strength against you; in the words of Danton, the greatest master of revolutionary policy yet known: *de l'audace, de l'audace, encore de l'audace!"* (135)

In these words Marx had explained the strategy of an uprising. Danton's aggressive policy had triumphed in the Great French Revolution, and France was able to defeat the coalition of all the great powers of Europe. Lenin, who knew his Marx almost by heart, on the eve of October called attention of his colleagues to the rules of revolutionary strategy emphasized by Marx, and in conclusion remarked, "Let us hope that in case the action is decided upon the leaders will successfully apply the great teachings of Danton and Marx." *(C. W.* XXI, Bk II, 98-9). The Bolshevik leaders followed Marx's teachings on the art of insurrection to the letter. In one swift drive they overwhelmed Kerensky's scattered forces and within a few short weeks became masters of the immense territory of the former Tsarist Empire.

Thus, on March 18, 1871 when the telegraph was transmitting to the world the news of the proletarian rising in Paris, Marx in London knew full well what principles the leaders of the revolutionary workers should adopt. And when a few days later it was obvious to him that they were not following the correct rules of insurrection, Marx, the greatest student of revolutions, was conscious of the fact that the policy they pursued would unfailingly bring death to the Paris Revolution.

6. *The Commune Under Fire; Marx's Silence Continues*

Bismarck realized that in the struggle of the two French regimes armed interference on the side of those suspected of betraying France to the invader would have precipitated a patriotic rising of the French masses. A new war would have caused complications in Germany where the organized working class was denouncing the policy of dismembering France. In other countries the bourgeoisie and the masses began to look at the conquering German power with distaste. Maintaining an air of neutrality, Bismarck let Thiers handle the Paris situation and confined his immediate material assistance to releasing regiments of the French Imperial troops in sufficient numbers to crush the Commune. Meanwhile an army composed of marines, gendarmes and Souaves was drawn up by Thiers before the capital.

On April 2, 1871 at one o'clock in the afternoon the bombardment of Paris began. The shelling of the city took the workers of Paris completely by surprise. Lissagaray, himself a soldier of the Commune, recorded: "At the report of the cannon all Paris started. No one believed in an attack, so completely did all, since the 28th, live in an atmosphere of confidence." (163)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Thiers opened the attack with a relatively small force of about 40,000 men (161). This time many of the 300,000 armed Paris workers sensed the correct proletarian policy and two hours later "At three o'clock 80,000 men were on their legs crying, 'To Versailles!' The women excited the battalions, and spoke of marching in the vanguard." (163)

The leadership of the Commune was divided. A strong minority, in response to the fiery spirit of the workers, demanded an immediate march on Versailles. The majority of the leaders was decidedly opposed. Having neglected the most elementary military measures, and having allowed a paralyzing laxity in the organizational structure of the National Guard, they now adopted a passive policy of "defense", thus signing the death warrant of the Commune. Giving vent to sentimental drivel, the Executive of the Commune placarded Paris with the statement of its policy: "Our duty is to defend the great city against these culpable aggressions." *(Ib.)*

Had the International now issued the long-pending Address, adding its voice to the voices of the 80,000 National Guards and their women who cried 'To Versailles', and unequivocally condemned the policy followed by the majority of the Executive of the Commune, the situation might have been reversed. The masses of Paris would have drawn the sorely needed ideological support from the authority of the International and very likely would have marched to victory over Thiers. Lissagaray records the first test of morale between the oddly assorted troops of Versailles and the Paris defenders: "At midday the Versaillese, having cannonaded the barracks of Courbevoie and the barricade, launched themselves to the assault. At the first shots from our men they scampered off, abandoning on the road cannon and officers." (162)

On Tuesday April 4, two days after Thiers had commenced his siege of Paris, the General Council of the International took up the question of an appeal to the masses of Paris. Here is a record of the policy pursued by Marx and Engels: "April 4th. At the session of the General Council Marx's proposal, presented by Engels, is adopted to temporarily refrain from issuing an appeal 'To the Population of Paris' in view of the latest events (the beginning of military action between Paris and Versailles." (Institute Marx-Engels-Lenin, *Karl Marx, Chronology of his Life and Activity*. R. 290)

Why this obvious sabotage on the part of Marx and Engels? From every aspect "the latest events" called for dropping all hesitation and delay and the immediate issuing of a proclamation of encouragement and correct instructions to Paris.

Let us recall, by contrast, Marx's activity during the establishment of the Trochu-Thiers gang in power. He took pride then in organizing meetings and demonstrations to urge the British imperialists to recognize the French bourgeois Republic. But no meetings, even of a token nature, were organized by Marx and Engels to give

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the workers of Paris moral and political support. And when "The International Democratic Association," a group headed by the petty-bourgeois Jacobin Le Lubez, a former member of the General Council, called public meetings in behalf of the Commune, Marx and Engels reacted with hostility. While they made it a regular practice to collaborate with the reactionary Urquartites, with bourgeois Liberals of all sorts, with capitalist reformers like the banker Langly of the Sunday League (Marx to Engels, November 20, 1868), in Jones Memorial, they flatly rejected the proposal for united front meetings in support of the Commune. Engels wrote on April 20, 1871:

"Dear Liebknecht: I am informing you hurriedly about the so-called 'International Democratic Association' probably utterly unknown to you, which therefore, could be confused with us . . . Since these people last Sunday *again* organized in Hyde Park a meeting in connection with the Paris Commune, which under *their* leadership inevitably *had to fail* (they even spread the rumor that we supposedly sent there representatives, although we gave the deputation sent to us our categoric refusal), and since they now want to form also affiliated sections on the Continent and will probably send to you a corresponding proposal—it is therefore necessary to tell you who those people are." (XXVI, R. 110)

The petty-bourgeois republicans leading the International Democratic Association did not shy away from speaking to the proletariat. On April 16 they presented an address to the Paris Commune "'adopted by the people of London assembled in public meeting convened by the International Democratic Association'" (London *Times,* April 17, 1871). In the Address they summed up the issue between the oppressors and the oppressed as best they could, inspired the defenders of the Commune with a sympathetic and encouraging message and expressed the hope for a general rising in France: "We wish you success in your heroic defense of the Commune, and trust the other great centers of industry in France will prove true to their Republican traditions, and emulate your illustrous example." *(Ib.)*

Apparently at the public demonstration of the International Democratic Association the speakers mentioned Marx and the General Council and denounced their policy. The reporter of the London *Times* presented the antagonism between the sections of the radical movement in bold enough relief: "Other so-called leaders were spoken of in a manner showing that there is no community of feeling between the sections of these people."

A few days after the petty-bourgeois Republicans sent their spirited *Address* to the Commune, the Paris correspondent of the London *Times* reported: "The *Journal Official* of today contains the following: 'The Commune has sympathetically welcomed the address of the English Republicans, and, on the part of Paris fighting for Communal franchises and the enfranchisement of the proletariat, sends them its sincere thanks.'" *(Times,* April 24, 1871). Incidentally, Marx and

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Engels never received any thanks from the Commune. This interesting void in the history of Marx's International, extremely striking in the light of the warm appreciation sent by the Commune to the Left bourgeois republicans, has been passed over in silence by the Marxist historians.

The same event that served Marx and Engels as a pretext for withholding the International's appeal to the Paris masses acted as a rousing signal to the workers of the French provincial towns. When the news of the military action against Paris reached the French workers they jumped to its defense as recorded by Lissagaray:

"The workmen of Rouen declared their adhesion to the Commune . . . On the 18th, at Nimes, the people, headed by a red flag, marched through the town to the cry of 'Vive la Commune! Vive Paris! Down with Versailles!' On the 16th, 17th, 18th, there were disturbances at Bordeaux. Some police agents were imprisoned, some officers ill-treated, the infantry barracks pelted with stones, the people crying, 'Vive Paris! Death to the traitors!' The movement even spread to the agricultural classes." (273)

Meantime across the Channel was a man who had come to occupy the unique position of *the* scientific political guide of the world proletariat, a man who possessed "the greatest head of our time" (Engels), and who could have outlined theoretical and practical strategy for the French working class. Seizing upon every pretext he maintained an unbroken official silence and maneuvered the General Council into a paralyzing passivity with respect to the civil war in France. Seven months earlier, in the *last* Address issued by the International dated September 9, 1870, Marx, in hailing the bourgeois Trochu-Thiers Republic declared: "The French working class moves, therefore, under circumstances of extreme difficulty." But now, when the difficulties as well as *possibilities* for the French working class had increased a thousand fold, Marx's International issued no addresses.

There are hardened skeptics who carry their incredulous attitude beyond all limits of logic and reasonable doubt even when confronted with overwhelming, incontrovertible evidence. They will ask: Did this investigator present *all* the facts in the case? Perhaps a more thorough research would unearth an appeal or a manifesto issued by the General Council on the eve of the Commune or during the seventy-odd days of its existence? We shall therefore summon our star witness, Marx himself. The Commune breathed its last on May 28, 1871, and Marx wrote: "With the exception of the Manifesto on the 'Civil War in France' (issued *after* the Commune on June 14, 1871—G. S.) and the message to Mr. Washburn (July 11, 1871—G. S.) which I had the honor of forwarding to you, the General Council did not publish a single manifesto since September 1870." (Marx to Collet, Sep. 6, 1871. XXVI, R., 146)

Thus throughout the whole momentous 1870-71 revolutionary situation in France, Marx and his General Council maintained a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

studied silence. And yet there were numerous vibrant moments in that situation. On October 31, 1870, long before the Commune, the proletariat of Paris temporarily removed the Trochu-Thiers regime from power but after a few hours of turmoil naively succumbed to the false promises of the arrested ministers that an election to set up a Communal regime would be instituted as soon as the deposed government was restored. On January 22, 1871 a new outbreak convulsed Paris. In February political interest in the internal French situation was heightened by the elections to the National Assembly. On March 1 the situation was extremely tense as the Prussian Army marched down the Champs Elysees and found itself virtually surrounded by the grim National Guard. Then when the Prussian Army withdrew after forty-eight hours came a torrent of rumors of the impending civil war in Paris. On March 4 the Thiers Government served a warning to the bourgeoisie: "A criminal insurrection is being organized in Paris." Then came March 18, the flight of the Government, the elections, the proclamation of the Commune. Dispatches told of the desperate plight of the Thiers regime. A special correspondent of the London *Times* reported: "I was at Versailles yesterday, and found the place full of war and rumours of war . . . Tents, ammunition, and other *materiel* of war are being rapidly collected from all quarters; but all these preparations are worthless without troops upon whom their leaders can count, and such troops are in a painful minority." (March 31, 1871). Marx read the dispatches; Marx studied the situation; Marx knew what policy might have brought victory to the Commune; Marx was silent.

When the battle for Paris started, Clusaret, the military chief of the Commune, gave orders to stay on the defensive. Six days later, on April 8, he declared " 'I repeat the order to remain strictly upon the defensive.' " *(Times,* April 13, 1871). Meanwhile Thiers was sending great reinforcements to his army and on May 21 the troops of General MacMahon entered the city. The workers, though resistance was futile, sacrificed themselves by the thousands in the Battle of the Barricades. But Marx was silent. The bourgeois press in lengthy dispatches, articles, editorials devoted pages and pages to the Commune —more than to any other event of the period. The London *Times* printed and reprinted a half-page map of Paris (April 6, 21, 28). The paper reported more demonstrations for the Commune conducted in Trafalgar Square and Hyde Park by the petty-bourgeois Republicans and quoted their emotional resolutions. Marx remained silent.

In dark Tsarist Russia, in St. Petersburg, a tiny paper put out by a small group headed by one, Goncharov, raised its voice for the Commune. This paper, called *The Gibbet,* declared, "We must wish, expect, make ready and assist the revolution to break through the walls of Paris and like a fiery lava pour into the kingdoms outside." Ten days later, *The Gibbet* printed an earnest appeal: "Respond, honest people, respond wherever you are to the aid of Paris which is

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

going down in destruction." (Cited in *Literaturnoie Nasledstvo,* #1). But Marx, supposedly one of the honest people, did not respond.

Reticence under certain circumstances is a positive expression of policy. When Stalin's Comintern Executive maintained a "mysterious" silence at the time Hindenburg appointed Hitler Chancellor it was a policy of waiting until the German workers were crushed. The more one ponders Marx's silence the less mysterious it becomes. The policy of silence on the part of the leader of the International on the question of the line for the revolutionary proletariat during the entire existence of the Paris Commune, a span of nearly two and a half months, must be regarded as a *conscious* crime with ulterior motives.

7. *Marx's Contacts with the Commune*

Marx was in direct contact with the Commune through a trusted messenger: "My relations with the Commune were maintained through a German merchant who travels between Paris and London all the year round." (Letter to Beesly, *Sel. Cor.* 314)

There is considerable information about Marx's connections with Paris contained in the work *Karl Marx, Chonology of his Life and Activity,* issued by the Stalin Institute of Marx-Engels-Lenin. From the *Chronology* it is seen that in about the middle of April his agent Seraillier informed him in writing of the situation in Paris (291). Serallier was not only Marx's personal emissary but was an official in the Commune administration (Engels to Sorge, May 3, 1873)

As more members of the International were elected to the Council of the Commune, the leaders turned for advice to the General Council in London. Early in May an emissary came to see Marx himself, as recorded in the *Chronology:* "Beginning of May. Marx makes his acquaintance with P. L. Lavrov who arrived from Paris to London in order, at the instruction of the Commune, to establish connection with the General Council." (292)

Even after the Commune fell, during the days of the White Terror in Paris, Marx was receiving reports from that city every day. (Letter to Beesly)

A clue to the consciousness of Marx's crime is clearly contained in a letter to Frankel, the Minister of Labor in the Commune. Writing twenty-four days after Thiers had opened the bombardment of Paris, Marx continued to squirm out of presenting an official document on the International's attitude and policy toward the Commune. The pretext he gave Frankel for having delayed an appeal to the world proletariat is patently a fraud: "In a few days the General Council will publish a proclamation regarding the Commune. Until now it has been postponing this manifesto since it was expecting from day to day precise information from its Paris section." (April 26, 1871. XXVI, R. 112). It was not the General Council but *Marx* who was delaying; the General Council had assigned him to write a manifesto weeks

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

before he wrote to Frankel. Marx gave Frankel a reason for putting an end to the interminable delay: "The Council can no longer delay because the English workers are impatiently awaiting enlightenment from it." *(Ib.)* But in the very next paragraph of this letter Marx contradicted himself by assuring Frankel that the workers *everywhere* were being enlightened regarding the Paris Commune: "Meanwhile, no time has been lost. By means of correspondence of different secretaries with the sections on the Continent and in the United States, the true characer of this great Paris revolution has been made clear to the workers everywhere."

But somehow this "everywhere" did not include Paris and did not embrace London, the seat of the General Council, the home of Marx and now of Engels. That Marx lied to Frankel and therefore to the Commune is definite because had such correspondence been conducted, at least one secretarial letter would have been preserved in the archives. And if such clarification were given why couldn't the General Council publish one of these letters as its position on the Commune? Simply because these "letters" never existed.

8. *The Butchers of the Proletariat Crash into Paris; Marx's Criminal Lies*

The letter in which Marx pledged to issue an appeal to the proletariat *in a few days* was dated April 26, 1871. The day before, at a session of the General Council, Marx had solemnly promised: "The Manifesto must be read at the next session." ("From the Unpublished Minutes of the General Council of the First International," *Bolshevik,* R. 1933, #6, 111). The truth was that at the time he gave promises to the General Council and to Frankel he had hardly begun writing the Address, even though the General Council had instructed him to do so weeks before. The Stalinist Marxists show this very clearly on page 292 in the volume *Karl Marx, Chronology of his Life and Activity:* "About 1st of May. Marx commences writing the Manifesto on the Commune (The Civil War in France)."

The beginning of May saw the battle for Paris steadily mounting to epic proportions; the clock of history was tolling the knell of the Commune. The political atmosphere in Europe and abroad was alive with keen interest in the outcome of the struggle between the growing army of Thiers and proletarian battalions of Paris which, though diminshing, were still throbbing with life, courage and hope. Yet Marx doggedly withheld any declaration of official policy towards the Commune and would offer no political guidance to its members or to the International. But he readily offered his "services" to the Commune on *commercial* matters: "I sent the members of the Commune a letter in answer to a question from them as to how they could handle certain securities on the London Exchange." (Letter to Beesly, June 12, 1871. *Sel. Cor.* 314)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

During the first half of May, Marx stopped attending the meetings of the General Council. He pleaded illness. Through Engels he sent word that despite his illness he was preparing an address to the proletariat. Meantime, the messenger of the Commune held a number of discussions with Marx on the question of giving Paris political instructions. Marx could not brush him off and therefore he finally agreed to dispatch a communication to two leaders of the Commune: "Between the 9th and 13th of May. Marx meets with the representative of the Commune several times and through him sends instructions to Frankel and Varlin on the 13 of May." *(Karl Marx, Chronology of his Life and Activity,* R. 293)

Marx's letter to Frankel and Varlin, who were adherents of the International, is lacking in anything even remotely resembling instructions of a revolutionary character. The letter contrasted sharply with the private one Marx had sent to Kugelmann on April 12 and to Liebknecht on April 6 in which he at least called attention to the failure of the Commune to march on Versailles. To any one familiar with the Stalin technique of evasion, it will be seen that Marx in the letter to Frankel and Varlin, avoided outlining a definite policy of struggle. "I have written several hundred letters in behalf of your cause to every corner of the world where we have branches. However, the working class has favored the Commune from the very beginning." (XXVI, R. 118; *Sel. Cor.* 311). This is most interesitng! Where are those letters "in behalf of *your* cause"? The Social Democratic researchers and historians have collected every scrap of paper, every available line Marx wrote in connection with the Commune. The Stalin burocrats did an incredibly thorough job of collecting almost every word Marx ever put on paper about the Commune. *Where are those letters?* How could "several hundred letters" sent "to every corner of the world" all vanish! It is obvious that Marx's assertion about writing "several hundred letters" was a deliberate lie to cover up his public silence on the Commune. But why such a huge lie, why did he not speak of a *dozen* instead of *hundreds* of letters? Because Marx realized that the occasion demanded widespread publicity among the members of the International and a small lie was incommensurate with the Paris events.

In his letter to Frankel and Varlin Marx further wrote that he was periodically inserting favorable remarks about the Commune into the bourgeois press: "Even the bourgeois papers in England have given up their early ferocity. I have succeeded in slipping some favorable paragraphs into them from time to time."

As with the "several hundred letters," this too is an easily verifiable lie. The files of the bourgeois press have been preserved, and the industrious collectors of Marx's works could without difficulty have noted these "favorable paragraphs" had Marx written them. Other people, from among the Republicans, did insert some sympathetic utterances for the Communards, as for example a Left Liberal, Bridges,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in *The Spectator*. But not Marx. All that there was of Marx's in the bourgeois press during the Commune was a letter to the London *Times* of April 4, 1871 in which he categorically denied the rumor that the Paris revolution had been organized in London. Two weeks earlier, before the proclamation of the Commune, he had sent a letter to the *Times* denouncing as a forgery a dispatch which asserted that he was not satisfied with the policy of the Paris members of the International. (XIII, Pt. II, R. 278). He thus gave the impression that whatever his Paris supporters were doing was meeting with his approval. Another letter Marx wrote was to the *Volksstaat* (March 23, 1871) in which he denied the rumors that the Paris branch of the International sought to expell German members.

Every Socialist and Bolshevik theoretician who studied the correspondence of Marx and Engels passed over in silence Marx's stories about "several hundred letters," about the "favorable paragraphs," and made no comments about the strange quiescence of the International. They went into raptures, however, particularly Lenin, over the two private letters Marx sent to his personal friend Dr. Kugelmann which were kept from the proletariat until 1902 when they were published by Kautsky. What is in these letters that caused the raptures? In the first dated April 12, 1871, Marx stated in retrospect: "They should have marched at once on Versailles." This sounds like sage advice, only *he never gave it to the Commune!* It was this private "advice" to Kugelmann that Lenin and others palmed off as Marx's revolutionary policy during the Commune. The second letter, dated April 17, simply contained spirited phrases eulogizing the workers of Paris. There is nothing in the letters to explain what *Marx's own line* was during the Commune, and why the International issued no appeals to the world proletariat.

On the 21 of May, after a heavy artillery bombardment, Thiers' troops entered Paris and the week of the battle of the barricades unfolded in all its fury. The workers refused to submit to Thiers. With many battalions decimated but with an unfaltering faith in their cause, they grimly sacrificed themselves to stem the now formidable force—in vain.

Playing in a negative way an extremely significant role in the bloody drama, Marx beheld the implementation of his political sabotage with the same cold heartlessness as some decades later Marx's disciple Lenin viewed the grim results of his policy in Finland and the Ukraine, and Stalin and Trotsky of theirs in China and Spain.

But members of the General Council were agitated and Marx quieted them by making "rosy" predictions for the hard-pressed workers of Paris. At the General Council meeting of April 25 he had given them a pep talk: "It is impossible to imagine how great the enthusiasm of the people and the National Guard is; and the Versaillese are simply madmen if they hope to enter Paris." ("From the Unpublished Minutes of the General Council of the First International," *Bolshevik,*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

1933, #6, R. 111). But Marx harbored no doubts as to the hopelessness of the situation. "Towards the end of April, no observer of any perspicacity could fail to see that the defense had become hopeless." (Lissagaray, 216)

On May 23, two days after the Versaillese, who were quite sane and realistic, had entered Paris, Marx appeared at the session of the General Council. With everybody sensing that Thiers was delivering the final blow to the Commune, Marx was forced to drop his falseface of bright hopes. He comforted his hearers with the assurance that the Commune's principles were "immortal." Further, in an indirect way he reminded them that eventually the proletariat would win its freedom. This of course no one could dispute. The consolation technique Marx employed has been used recurrently by the Stalin, Trotsky, Social Democratic and Anarchist burocrats after each major betrayal of the proletariat. Marx's long-range "optimism" was recorded:

"Citizen Marx explained that he was sick and could not finish the Address which he had promised to prepare, but he hoped that it would be ready by next Tuesday. Going over to the question of the struggle in Paris he said 'He fears that the end is near, but if the Commune is destroyed, the struggle will only be postponed. The principles of the Commune are immortal and cannot be wiped out. They will assert themselves again and again until the working class gains its emancipation.' " (From the Speech delivered by K. Marx at the session of the General Council of the International Workingmen's Association, May 23, 1871. XIII, Pt. II, R. 657)

How authentic is the excuse of illness Marx gave for not having finished the Address? Records show that from March 18, the day of the Paris uprising, till May 1, Marx was busy copying citations in his own hand from the English and French newspapers. Just before the middle of May he was not too ill to engage in discussions with the Commune's emissary Lavrov for several days in succession and to write to Frankel and Varlin. It was on the 30 of May, after the Commune had succumbed, that Marx read his "Address," factually a book, before the General Council. The Stalinist researchers, however, in possession of the draft of this work, calculated that it was written in the first half of May! "In the archives of the IMEL (Marx-Engels-Lenin-Institute—G. S.) there is the original draft of 'The Civil War in France' composed by Marx probably not later than the first ten days of May 1871, i.e., *long before the fall of the Commune.* This original draft is almost twice the size of the final work." *(Istoric Marxist,* 24. Our emph.—G. S.)

A perusal of the first draft *(Arkhiv Marksa i Engelsa,* (VIII) III) reveals why they correctly concluded that Marx wrote it in the first part of May since he cited no event or publication dated later than the early days of that month. However, the matter does not end there. The Stalinists also discovered a second draft, but this draft does not contain any reference to the entry of the Versailles on May 21 and

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the ensuing Battle in the Streets. It is clear, therefore, that when Marx appeared at the May 23 sitting of the General Council and reported he had not finished the Address, he in fact had two drafts prepared, each twice the size of the final published version, sufficiently completed for scrutiny by the General Council. Be it noted that the draft which Marx finally did read to the Council was not a finished product either. It was considerably revised and corrected before it was distributed to the workers. (Marx to Beesly, June 12, 1871). Thus, Marx delayed in presenting the Address to the General Council until there was no doubt that the assassination of the Commune was definitive.

What was the duration of his alleged sickness? According to his letter to Danielsen dated June 13, 1871 his illness lasted eight weeks. By an "odd coincidence" eight weeks cover the major part of the existence of the Paris Commune! That Marx was able to write during these eight weeks is best illustrated by the volume of work he performed. The first and the second drafts of *The Civil War in France* are model examples of colossal research done in a very short time. The mass of incidental details testifies to the vast amount of reading and copying Marx did. A letter of Engels to Dr. Kugelmann dated April 28, 1871, in the very middle of that "eight-week" period, throws light on the character of Marx's much publicized illness during the Paris Commune. Engels wrote: "Concerning Marx's condition, you have formed a very dark picture. First of all about your bold diagnosis ascribing his cough to catarrh of the lungs. Marx and I have a very capable young doctor (Scotchman) who can also do the tapping and listening very well like the majority of German doctors, and he declared what I thought long ago, namely: the cough is in the throat, the lungs are in perfect condition. He says that, naturally, it is not so easy to get rid of such an old and neglected cough, and predicts that even if it disappears during the summer it will return in the autumn." (XXIV, R. 112)

Most felicitously Engels was beside his sick friend, administering very effective medicine, as he related to Kugelmann: "By no means can I live without exercise in fresh air and therefore Marx willi-nilly is compelled to promenade with me, and for him this is the best medicine." (113)

Marx's eight-week "sickness" was chiefly *political.* It was the "sickness" of *evasion.* Marx himself had furnished an example of vitality in sickness when his *real* cause was involved. At the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War Marx was not well. On July 20, 1870 he wrote to Engels: "Yesterday the General Council assigned me to write the Address. This is not too pleasant in my present state of liver trouble and dullness." However, the concern over the destiny of Germany roused Marx to action. On July 23, only four days after he had received the assignment, the General Council issued the Address in which Marx presented his thinly veiled support to Bismarck: "On the German side the war is a defensive war." But during the Commune,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which to the working class was of incomparably greater importance than the Franco-Prussian War, Marx, with many weeks at his disposal, and despite a long-standing assignment, maintained official silence.

9. *"The General" Ignored the Commune*

People close to Engels had profound respect for his military erudition. "His passionate interest in military science won him the nickname of 'the general,' and his friends thought of him as the Carnot of a future German revolution." (Mayer, 51)

What had Engels been doing with his military science all these epic weeks of the Commune? On other occasions, as we recall, he had written volumes on war strategy and tactics. With a prodigal hand he had scattered advice to the bourgeoisie during the Italian War and the Civil War in America; and in the Franco-Prussian War he had even offered Gambetta, a member of the Trochu-Thiers government, a plan to counteract Bismarck's pressure for Alsace and Lorraine: "Engels sent to Gambetta's secretary, through Lafargue, a memorandum containing a carefully thought-out plan for raising the siege to Paris." (N. and M-H. 318)

From July 1870 to March 1871 Engels produced sixty articles on the military situation in the Franco-Prussian War and they were printed in the Liberal *Pall Mall Gazette,* the last one appearing on March 16, two days before the proletarian rising in Paris. But he shied away from offering any military suggestions to the Paris Commune!

The revolutionary workers of Paris were quite aware of the mental inertia of their leadership. They wrote letters to newspapers urging energetic action, and a number of exhortations appeared in the paper *Pere Duchene.* The Russian Stalinist researchers collected the messages in a compilation: *Letters of Workers Correspondents of the Paris Commune.* "Why is the Commune showing such lack of energy?" demanded one correspondent (33). "Does the Commune intend to behave after the plan of Trochu?" asked another, alluding to General Trochu's mock defense of Paris during the Prussian siege. (56). "Keep spurring on the members of the Commune, so that they shouldn't be caught napping" prodded a third, sensing that the leaders were not on their guard. (72). But there came not a word of warning, of guidance, of military advice from "the general." And, indeed, what other military policy could Engels have suggested to the Commune except the correct principles on the art of insurrection! But it was just these scientific principles which might have proved life-saving for the workers of Paris that he and Marx assiduously withheld, just as they had *consciously* concealed the *Communist Manifesto* during the Revolution of 1848! So "the general" limited the scene of "application" of his military knowledge to London: "During the Paris Commune Engels was informing the General Council on the Paris military situation." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XLIV, 258)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

10. *The True Position of Marx and Engels on the Paris Commune*

An extremely important, politically revealing statement by Marx allowing a glimpse of his private thoughts, occurs in a letter he wrote to Niewenhuis on February 22, 1881. Long before 1881, Marx, be it remembered, as well as Engels, had evaluated the Commune as the government of the proletariat. Therefore it was impossible for them to believe in 1881 that a compromise and peace could have been effected between the Commune and the Thiers regime. Knowing full well that an unsurmountable wall separated the insurrectionary masses of Paris from the Versailles bourgeoisie, Marx, speaking about the leaders of the Commune stated in his letter to Niewenhuis: "With a small amount of sound common sense, however, they could have reached a compromise with Versailles useful to the whole mass of the people—the only thing that could be reached at the time." *(Sel. Cor.* 387)

If a "compromise" were the *only* course for the Commune, why didn't Marx advocate this course in March, or April, or May 1871? Why did he squirm, procrastinate, play sick, lie to Frankel and Varlin about "several hundred letters"?

Moreover, records show that Marx opposed the advocates of the "compromise" solution of the struggle in France: "First of May. Marx and Engels reject the suggestion of Oswald and Kern to participate in the meeting at which it is proposed to outline the measures for negotiations between Paris and Versailles." *(Karl Marx, Chronology* R. 292)

In the light of Marx's 1881 statement, the supposedly correct line was pursued during the Paris Commune by the bourgeois Liberals. The city councils of Lille, Lyons, St. Omer and of many other municipalities pressed Versailles for a compromise with Paris (Lissagaray, 272-3). Liberal bourgeois groups in Paris took a similar "1881 Marxist" attitude towards the Commune.

But at that time Marx did not dare to propose a "compromise" to the Commune which he, a few days after its fall, assessed to have been "essentially a working class government," "the glorious harbinger of a new society," "a lever for uprooting the economic foundations upon which rests the existence of classes, and therefore of class rule" *(Civil War in France),* because revolutionary workers would have later suspected in this veiled proposal of capitulation to Thiers the voice of treason.

Worthy of particular attention is the fact that in 1881, when Marx finally penned this "only" position for the Commune, he had concluded all of his essential studies. He had pointed out in *The Civil War in France* (June 1871) how Thiers, while preparing his war on the Commune, neatly fostered the illusion that he was proffering the olive branch: "By the semblance of peace negotiations with Paris, Thiers found the time to prepare for war against it." *(C. W.* II, 513).

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

With consummate skill Thiers utilized this pretense: "His banditti-warfare against Paris, exalted in his own bulletins, and the attempts of his ministers at the establishment, throughout France, of a reign of terror, Thiers was from the beginning anxious to accompany with a little by-play of conciliation, which had to serve more than one purpose. It was to dupe the provinces, to inveigle the middle class element in Paris, and, above all, to afford the professed republicans in the National Assembly the opportunity of hiding their treason against Paris behind their faith in Thiers." (514)

Marx had shown that in the "compromise" talks with the delegates from Paris, the shrewd leader of the bourgeoisie made no real concessions: "The concessions held out by Thiers in his interminable interviews with the delegates from Paris and the provinces, although constantly varied in tone and color, according to time and circumstances, did in fact never come to more than the prospective restriction of revenge to the 'handful of criminals implicated in the murder of Lecomte and Clement Thomas,' on the well-understood premise that Paris and France were unreservedly to accept M. Thiers himself as the best of possible Republics, as he, in 1830, had done with Louis Philippe." (514-515)

Finally, in May, after his forces had entered Paris, "Thiers on the 22nd, revealed to the Rurals the 'goal' of his conciliation comedy, which they had so obstinately persisted in not understanding." (518)

Marx, however, understood this "conciliation comedy." And when ten years later, in 1881, he declared that the Commune could have reached a compromise with Versailles, that a compromise was "the only thing that could be reached at the time," and that it would have been "useful to the whole mass of the people," he revealed himself once again as a political hypocrite.

Let us view Marx's "compromise" thesis from another angle. If that should have been the policy of the Commune, why didn't Marx insert a statement to that effect in *The Civil War in France,* which all his deifiers laud as a magnificent analysis of the Paris Commune? Why didn't he state that the Commune's failure to achieve a compromise with Versailles was a blunder? Why did he state that the correct policy should have been a vigorous offensive against Versailles, not offers of peace?

There were other falsifications Marx introduced to cover up his own guilt. In an article published in *Volkstaat* of October 2, 1872, Marx declared: "The revolution must be made with solidarity; we learn this from the Paris Commune, which only fell because just this solidarity was lacking among the workers of the other countries." *(Sel. Cor.* 165). Marx's assertion that there was "lack of solidarity" is a patent falsehood. It is sufficient to cite Lissagaray, whose work Marx edited: "Throughout all Europe the working classes eagerly awaited news from Paris, were in their hearts fellow-combatants of the great

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

town, now become their capital, multiplied their meetings, processions, and addresses." (228-9)

But why go to various historians, when Marx himself, only a month before he printed his "lack of solidarity" excuse, had stated quite plainly in his report to the Hague Congress that "The Paris Commune was immediately welcomed with greetings by the entire international proletariat." (XIII, R. 490)

Marx's story of "lack of solidarity" is both a lie and a slander of the working class and is similar to the Stalinist slander of the German workers for "allowing" Hitler to take power. In 1871 the revolutionary workers everywhere watched France with bated breath; and they, no less than the French workers, felt they suffered a defeat when their hope was shattered on the blood-drenched barricades of Paris. Marx knew all this for he himself then recorded in *The Civil War in France* that "The Commune annexed to France the working people all over the world." *(C. W.* II, 508)

The reason for the fall of the Commune, contrary to Marx's fictitious reason he gave in October 1872, was that there was no proletarian-revolutionary political and organizational center to weld and direct the world proletarian solidarity. The International which pretended to perform this function was an organization opposed to the interests of the proletariat. The upper circle in control of this body was a cesspool of burocratic corruption, of nationalist allegiance to Germany, of deliberate sabotage of the struggle for Socialism.

Fully conscious of his own role in the General Council, and aware that the activity of the workers of various countries could be coordinated and systematized on the international scale only through an organized political world center, Marx in 1875, after he had burocratically destroyed the International, covered up his act as follows: "The international activity of the working classes does not in any way depend on the existence of the International Workingmen's Association." *(Critique of the Gotha Programme)*

One does not have to go far afield for the correct explanation of Marx's "mysterious" behavior during the Paris Commune. When Marx in the September 1870 Address of the International exclaimed *Vive la Republique!* he really meant it. He wanted the French Republic of wage slavery to live, to continue as the political system of France. He and Engels did not want the French proletariat to attack the Thiers political machine. Engels admitted that the International, that is Marx and he, "did not lift a finger" to establish the Commune. (Letter to Sorge, Sept. 12, 1874. *S. W.* II, 623). In their private political scheme of things they completely excluded France or any other country, and designated only Germany, to emerge as a Workers State. However, like King Canute, Marx was unable to stop the proletarian tide in France. There came the rising of March 18, 1871 and the proclamation of the Commune. What was Marx to do? An Address from the International was immediately on the order of the day, but

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

what could he have said in it? Apart from felicitating the proletariat of Paris, he would have had to present a policy, to warn the workers not to lose a minute but to take off in hot pursuit of the Thiers crew. And what policy could he have outlined in an appeal to the rest of the masses of France? He would have had to exhort them to emulate their brothers in Paris, while to the masses of Germany, Italy, England and other countries he would have had to urge moral and material support to the revolution in France.

Marx, naturally, could not do all that. On the other hand, it would have been utterly impossible for the International to issue a lifeless document devoid of a policy. There was no choice for him but silence and let the Proudhonists, Bakuninists, Blanquists and Jacobins transform Paris into a military trap for the revolutionary workers. The destruction of the proletarian vanguard of Paris, no less than the victory of the Prussians over France, was indispensable to Marx and Engels. If the hegemony of Germany in the system of bourgeois nations and of their own forces within the working class over those of Proudhon, Blanqui, Bakunin and the Jacobins were to be secured, and if their fond dream of eventually establishing the *German* Workers State with themselves in control was to come true, the Commune had to be swept away.

The leaders of the Commune could be safely relied on to do their destructive part. Marx knew this not only from his study of their politics but, above all, from observing their specific actions. Eight days before he wrote his first letter on the Commune to Kugelmann, bourgeois correspondents reported from Paris that the leaders of the Commune had completely lost their heads: "What do the men of the Commune ask? Nobody knows any longer; they do not know themselves. They give orders at random without knowing what they are doing." (London *Times*, April 8, 1871)

As a matter of fact, at no time, either before or after the Proclamation of the Commune, did the leaders of the Commune know what they were doing as Lenin correctly observed: "Those who created the Commune did not understand it because they were creating it through the intuition of the awakened genius of the masses, but not a single fraction of the French Socialists was conscious of its actions." (XV, R. 153)

Marx, of course, who knew precisely what to do, was quite conscious of their actions.

Marx's own "activity" during the Commune was betrayal by default. He avoided lifting a finger to aid the workers of Paris even in such an indirect manner as merely calling a public meeting. He went to the length of sabotaging the demonstrations held by others on behalf of the Commune. But after it was all over, Marx became transformed and, displaying great "sympathy" for the Communards, worked to help them escape the White Terror in France: "June-December. Marx unfolds an extremely energetic activity in the task

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

/ozilla/5.0
TP_ACCEPT-

of organizing aid to the refugees of the Commune; until September he directs the work of the Emigrant Committee; mobilizes his acquaintances and correspondents; secures money and work for the refugees, and passports for the Communards remaining in France." *(Chronology* 293-4)

We have become accustomed to the hypocritical spectacle presented by the Stalin, Trotsky, Socialist and Anarchist burocrats who assume the appearance of dignified mourners for the victims they betray to the Fascist and White Guard hangmen of the exploiters. This method of hiding the identity of the betrayers was, as we see, first introduced within the proletarian camp by Marx and Engels. When the anniversary of the March 18 Revolution came around they made plans for a public meeting to pay their respects to the memory of the martyrs of the Commune. (Engels to Sorge, March 17, 1872)

11. *Biographical Apologists and Lying Marxist Theoreticians*

There is little point in examining all the distortions of all the biographers of Marx and in answering every falsification. It will suffice to give one or two examples of political fiction with respect to Marx's role in the Paris Commune. Mehring writes: "It was not that he was unwilling to take complete responsibility for the action and omissions of the Commune, for he did that immediately after its defeat in full public and in all detail, but because he felt no inclination to play the role of dictator and to determine from afar what was to be done on the spot by those who could best see what should be done and what not." *(Karl Marx,* 475). Marx, the dictator of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* the head burocrat of the Communist League and of the International, abhorred, according to Mehring, the role of dictator! As to Mehring's assertion that the leaders of the Commune knew better than Marx what policy to pursue, this too is an obvious distortion of fact.

Let us take up a deception or two advanced by the choicest political hypocrites in the proletariat. A spokesman of the Stalin burocracy lies as follows: "When the Commune was proclaimed Marx immediately enlisted in the defense of this workers' government." (Lozovsky, *Marx and the Trade Unions,* 79). An incomparibly more eminent liar penned this brazen piece of deception: "But when, in March, 1871, the decisive struggle was *forced* upon the workers and they accepted it, when the rising had become a fact, Marx greeted the proletarian revolution with the greatest enthusiasm, in spite of the unfavorable auguries." (Lenin, *State and Revolution)*

Since Lenin could point to no official greeting by Marx, he was compelled to refer to Marx's *private* letters to Kugelmann written *after* Thiers had started shelling Paris, never known even to Lenin himself until published by Kautsky in 1902.

Lenin exploited Marx's private letters to Dr. Kugelmann to the

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

fullest degree and did his utmost to create the impression that the observations these letters contained were publicly known during the Commune! Thus in 1907 in his preface to Marx's *Letters to Dr. Kugelmann,* Lenin, making an attack on Plekhanov's condemnation of the December 1905 uprising, extolled Marx's supposed encouragement of the Communards: "Did he preach to the Communards as Plekhanov did to the December fighters, the sermon of the smug philistine: 'They should not have resorted to arms'? No. On April 12, 1871 Marx writes an *enthusiastic* letter to Kugelmann (who resided not in Paris but in Hanover, Germany—G. S.)—a letter which we would gladly see hung on the wall of the home of every Russian Social-Democrat and of every literate Russian worker. In September 1870 Marx called the insurrection desperate folly, but in April 1871, when he saw the mass movement of the people, he treated it with the great attention of a man participating in great events which marked a step forward in the world historic movement." *(Ib.)*

Continuing his fictitious narrative about Marx's attitude toward the Commune, Lenin sought to make the uninformed readers feel that Marx's purely private remark in the letter to Kugelmann was widely known in 1871 and was a part of a serious and official discussion conducted in the International by Marx on the vital issue of military tactics for the Commune: "But Marx was not filled with the wisdom of these gudgeons who are afraid to discuss the *technique* of the higher forms of revolutionary struggle. It was precisely the *technical* questions of the insurrection that he discussed. Defense or attack? he asks, as if the military operations were taking place outside of London, and he decides that it must be attack: *'They should have marched at once on Versailles . . .'*" (17). Lenin craftily combines *his* description of Marx's supposed policy for the Commune "it must be attack," which implies *immediate* or *future* action, with *Marx's* actual remark *"They should have* marched . . .," which takes note of neglect in the *past.*

Lenin added "This was written in April 1871, a few weeks before the great and bloody days of May" thus continuing the deception that Marx formulated an aggressive strategy for the Commune in time to save the Revolution. Lenin omitted the *key* phrase in Marx's letter to Kugelmann: "The right moment was missed." (123)

12. *Marx's "The Civil War in France," a Cover for the Betrayal*

Marx realized the all-important need of covering up his policy of silence. The most effective cover—the Comintern and the Trotsky burocrats have perfected this technique—is a stirring post mortem on the revolution. Therefore Marx used his resourcefulness to the fullest and produced a work seemingly fired by enthusiasm for "The glorious working men's Revolution of the 18th March," containing pertinent suggestions as to what should have been done to achieve

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
ITTP_ACCEPT-

victory, voicing tribute to the heroism of the defenders of the Commune and ruthlessly excoriating the French bourgeoisie. Scientifically the work is false in its very root. Marx presents the position that the Commune was a French proletarian State; and he repeated this lusty myth some months later in another document: "The last and greatest of all movements that have ever taken place was the Commune, and (there can be no two opinions about it) the Commune was the conquest of political power by the working class." (*N. Y. World*, Oct. 15, 1871; *The London Conference of the First International*, 205.)

However, ten years later, in a private letter to Nieuwenhuis dated February 22, 1881 Marx gave a second opinion which was close to fact. This private opinion shows that he understood that in *class* nature the Paris Commune was guided by a Left section of the French bourgeoisie and was a bourgeois State: "Of one thing you may be sure: a Socialist government will not arrive to power in a country where conditions have not become sufficiently ripe to make it possible with the aid of necessary measures, to immediately suppress the bourgeoisie to such a degree that the prerequisite condition, time for future operations, would be assured. Perhaps you will point to the Paris Commune. But apart from the fact that this was merely an uprising of only one city in exceptional circumstances, the majority of the Commune was in no sense Socialist nor could it be." (XXVII, R. 116; *Sel. Cor.* 386-7)

Engels, knowing that the private opinion Marx held about the Commune was to be kept private, advanced only Marx's public position; "Look at the Paris Commune. That was the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." (Introduction to the *Civil War in France*, March 18, 1891. *S. W.* II, 460). "Paris Commune, where the proletariat for the first time held political power for two whole months . . ." (Int. to *Com. Man.* June 24, 1872, *S. W.* I, 190)

Many Marxists repeated this false evaluation. Thus, Trotsky: "In 1871 the proletariat consciously took into its hands the administration of social affairs in petty-bourgeois Paris." (*Perspectives*, R. 36). However some Marxists understood that it would be risky to promulgate this false evaluation without adding some ambiguous phrases which would create a combination of a bourgeois and a proletarian State. So Lenin applied this technique and wrote that it was a "proletarian dictatorship" but not a real one:

"Perhaps it was a real, *pure* dictatorship of the proletariat in the sense that its composition and the nature of its practical tasks were purely Social-Democratic? Certainly not! The class-conscious proletariat (and only more or less class-conscious, at that) i.e. the members of the International were in a minority; the majority of the government consisted of representatives of petty-bourgeois democracy." (*Proletari*, July 17, 1905; *Paris Commune*, 57)

In fine, the Paris workers gave enthusiastic support to petty

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

bourgeois democrats, some sheer adventurers, who did not present even a ghost of a Socialist program. "Instead of voting for a programme, they voted for names. Those who had demanded the Commune, made a mark at the Corderie or during the siege, were elected without being asked for further explanations." (Lissagaray, 154)

This vital negative feature Marx passed over in silence, without indicating the indispensability of a political program. He thus sidestepped the issue lest the workers inquire into the failure on the part of the General Council of the International to provide one for the Commune.

Insofar as voting was concerned, the Commune's "democracy" was limited to *male* suffrage which was taken over with hardly any modification from the Thiers regime. Even the election lists were the same ones drawn up in the February 8 elections to the National Assembly under Thiers. "The elections were to be conducted with the lists of February and in the usual manner." (127). And even the male suffrage was of a narrow character, the young workers were not given the right to vote.

The nefarious system of burocratic appointments and removals at once began to corrode the Commune's executive machinery. Commissions, delegates to various branches of the administration and individual officials were all appointed from above, never elected to their positions by the workers. The political biographies of leading figures were concealed. The top military post was assigned to Cluseret, but the masses of Paris never knew that Clusaret had participated in the butchery of the Paris workers in June 1848 and that he had but just recently served in America as an officer in the Army of the Southern slaveholding aristocracy (London *Times*). Cluseret received his post of Delegate at War not through the democratic approval of the workers of the National Guard but by the burocratic appointment of the Executive Commission, itself a burocratically constituted body never ratified by the workers. Cluseret was given an assistant, "Eudes, who, being a member of the so-called party of action, owed this post only to the patronage of his old cronies." (Liss. 164). Cluseret in his turn appointed Rossel, a young adventurist officer, as chief of staff. Cluseret was eventually removed, but this, too, was accomplished not through democratic recall by the workers but, as in all other instances of removal of officers, by the burocratic Council. So palpably undemocratic became the atmosphere in the top circles that "certain members of the Council and generals dreamt of a military dictatorship." (216). Indeed the paper *The Commune* of May 10 demanded that General Rossel be declared dictator of Paris. Next day Rossel was arrested on charges of treason.

The Council of the Commune passed undemocratic decisions from the start. Immediately upon its formation it burocratically excluded workers from the proceedings: "The Council never admitted the public, whose presence would have prevented many faults." (157). The

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Council usurped the right to decide who should join its own ranks from those chosen in the supplementary elections. "One with less than 1100 votes was admitted, another with 2500 rejected." (203)

Marx in *The Civil War in France,* by concealing the Commune's reactionary line of not extending the suffrage to the working class women and youth, by covering up the burocratism of the Council of the Commune and the rotten history of some of its high leaders, by creating the impression that *all* the officials were elected by the workers, and that these officials were "responsible and revocable at short terms" by the workers, gave a dishonest picture of Commune's "democracy." It was no accident that Marx did not raise the issue of women's suffrage. His personal ideology was not only burocratic and German nationalist but, intrinsically, also male chauvinist. In this respect the *Communist Manifesto* too suffers perceptibly.

The Commune's "democracy" was in reality a form of *bourgeois* democracy which in its freest form lasted only a few brief days and which rapidly became transformed into a military dictatorship camouflaged with revolutionary phrases. Marx's assertion in *The Civil War in France* that the Commune was "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economic emancipation of labor" was false, since it was a *bourgeois* form. Marx said the Commune "aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators" but quite the contrary was true. Engels, in a preface to *The Civil War in France* (March 18, 1891) pretended that he could not understand the deep reverence the leaders of the Commune showed for the property of the French bourgeoisie: "The hardest thing to understand is certainly the holy awe with which they remained standing respectfully outside the gates of the Bank of France. This was also a serious political mistake. The bank in the hands of the Commune—this would have been worth more than ten thousand hostages. It would have meant the pressure of the whole of the French bourgeoisie on the Versailles government in favor of peace with the Commune." *(S. W.* II, 456)

We have shown that Marx did not hesitate to furnish advice to the leaders of the Commune on such trivial points "as to how they could handle certain securities on the London Exchange." But on such a vital issue as taking possession of the financial resources of the French bourgeoisie Marx had no advice to offer. Engels circumspectly left Marx's and his own name out of the case.

Equally false was the impression conveyed by Marx that "the great social measures of the Commune" were of a proletarian-revolutionary character. They were bourgeois-reformist in *class* nature and nothing more. After 1917 bourgeois democracies in Europe and Roosevelt's New Deal in the United States went infinitely further than the Commune in introducing temporary relief measures for the proletariat. Marx surrounded the Commune with an atmosphere of "Social republic," supposedly the first step in the formation of the World Proletarian State. The fact was that though the leaders in Paris de-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

clared "the flag of the Commune is the flag of the World Republic," the Paris Commune was a Left-bourgeois expression of French nationalism. The social ideals of the Commune were tinged with the bourgeois-democratic traditions. It is quite clear that had Thiers adopted a more skillful policy of dealing with the Commune, its leadership would have compromised with the big bourgeoisie and the whole affair would have become merely an episode in the establishment of the Third Republic.

In distorting the class nature of the Commune, Marx sought to strengthen the impression that the Commune actually had been moving towards becoming a World Republic. Therefore, he made much of the Commune's policy of enlisting foreigners in its service. However, virtually every regime, even the most outspokenly reactionary, adheres to such practice. On the other hand, Marx kept silent about the Commune's order of April 24, *(Times)* signed by Delescluse which exempted Alsacians and Lorrainers living in Paris from service in the National Guard. The exclusion of these French "foreigners" was a gesture to Bismarck, a tacit recognition of his annexation of Alsace and Lorraine.

Nothing is so striking in Marx's supposed study of the Commune as his total evasion of an analysis of the various tendencies in its leadership. Writing not as a political student of revolution but as a guilty burocrat, Marx realized that he would have drawn a barrage of counter-criticism from the Proudhonists, Bakuninsts, Blanquists and Jacobins—all having forces within the International. And since he did not review these tendencies it was logical for the workers reading his "analysis" to overlook the necessity of probing into Marx's own policy.

Marx's academic superiority over his Latin rivals played a part in making his document "indispensable" to every worker who could find no similarly readable and seemingly correct account of the event. This allowed Engels to exclaim in his work, *The Housing Question:* "what work from the Latin side has even approximately so correctly understood and described the Commune as the *Address of the General Council of the International* on the Civil War in France, written by the German, Marx."

Applying the padding technique employed on *Capital,* on *The Critique of Political Economy* and on other works, Marx enlarged the document on the Commune with the type of material appearing in the gossip column of the yellow capitalist papers. He dug into the personal life of every eminent leader in the Thiers Government, supposedly for the purpose of enlightening the workers. Jules Favre had been "living with the wife of a drunken resident at Algeires"; "Gallifet, the kept man of his wife"; the brother of Ernest Picard had been a "penniless Barrister before the 4th of September." Was this the "precise information" Marx required before issuing an official document on the Commune?

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Marx's betrayal of the proletariat during the Paris Commune and the cover up of this betrayal with the "Address" was the political climax in the International's criminal work which began with the deceptions about Lincoln and Seward. The burocratic climax, the frame-up of Bakunin, came a year and a half after the Commune. In September 1874 Engels in a letter to Sorge shamelessly boasted: "For ten years the International dominated one side of European history—the side on which the future lies—and can look back upon its work with pride." The true "work" of Marx's International was never revealed to the proletariat. The Liberal historians, out of sheer ignorance or inability to grasp the nature of Marx's political work, and the handful of erudite Marxists in conscious dishonesty, drew an idealized portrait of a sublime Marx in his attitude toward the Paris Commune. Unquestionably the palm of haloing Marx belonged to Lenin. Masterfully distorting the truth, Lenin conveyed the impression that Marx had *actively* aided the proletariat of Paris: "After the fall of the Paris Commune (1871)—which Marx analyzed as a man of *action*, a revolutionist, with so much penetration, pertinence and brilliance in his work *The Civil War in France, 1871*." ("Karl Marx," *C. W.* XVIII, 18-19)

While writing to Kugelmann that the Commune should have advanced on Versailles, Marx knew how dangerous it would have been to his secret plans if he had said so publicly because reports continued to arrive showing that the military odds were still in favor of the workers of Paris: "M. Thiers has not advanced a step towards the subjugation of Paris. Troops are coming in daily from Germany, and Marshal Mac Mahon has accepted the supreme command, but up to Friday morning no advantage had been gained. On the contrary, Dombrowsky, the new General of the Commune, had by the latest accounts reorganized the National Guards and carried the bridge of Neuilly, while Issy and Vanvas had driven off sharp attacks." (*The Spectator*, April 15, 1871)

Marx in *The Civil War in France* branded the physical murderers of the Paris Commune and paid a stirring tribute to the fallen heroes of the proletariat. Were his words sincere? A revealing facet of Marx's and Engels' thoughts is their secret attitude toward the internal affairs of the International as compared with their official attitude toward the proletariat. Gustav Mayer records a point indicating that Marx and Engels viewed their own public utterances against the bourgeoisie and their flashes of lofty rhetoric about the future emancipation of the proletariat as mere "palaver." The *real* business of Marx and Engels during the hounding of the French revolutionary workers after the Commune was the preparations for the factional war on Bakunin: "While the members of the International were being hunted out and prosecuted in France, the internal conflict in the Association increased in violence. Was it prudent to bring them to a head at a public congress? Engels held it wiser 'to have a public palaver and do

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the business in secret.' In agreement with Marx he moved that the disputed points of organization and policy should be settled at a private conference in London." (222)

Thus in the period when *The Civil War in France* was printed—June, 1871—the factional burocratic preparations for the September 1871 Conference of the International, carried on in secrecy against the Bakuninists, clearly reflected the public and private corruption of Marx and Engels.

Tucked away in the seemingly sincere pages of *The Civil War in France* was a statement which history exposed as a deception when Marx, a year and a half later, at the Hague, banished the International to its death: "Wherever, in whatever shape, and under whatever conditions the class struggle obtains any consistency, it is but natural that members of our Association should stand in the foreground. The soil out of which it grows is modern society itself. It cannot be stamped out by any amount of carnage. To stamp it out, the governments would have to stamp out the despotism of capital over labor—the condition of their own parasitical existence." *(S. W.* II, 525). The governments did not have to stamp out the domination of capital over the workers to get rid of the International. Marx himself, without asking either the proletarian membership or even the lesser burocratic leaders, eliminated the International in order, he later said, to "fool" these governments.

Marx concluded *The Civil War in France* with words of sublime beauty: "Working men's Paris, with its Commune, will be forever celebrated as the glorious harbinger of a new society. Its martyrs are enshrined in the great heart of the working class. Its exterminators history has already nailed to that eternal pillory from which all the prayers of their priests will not avail to redeem them." *(Ib.)* How well this type of hypocritical palaver has been diverting the mind of the proletariat for many decades from the true Marx and Engels, the *real* political executioners of the Paris proletarian vanguard during the Commune of 1871!

The blood of the tens of thousands of proletarians who fell on the barricades or perished in prisons in France and in exile will forever remain on the hands of Marx and Engels, burocrats and German chauvinists, the *conscious* political butchers of the workers of Paris.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER VIII.

MARX'S DREAD OF A FRENCH WORKERS STATE AND THE IRONY OF HISTORY

1. *The "German Socialism" of Marx and Engels*

THE MULTIPLE betrayal of the world proletariat by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin stem, as has been shown, from their Great Russian nationalism and organizational burocratism. The key to Marx's betrayal of the Paris proletariat is his German nationalism and burocratism, his basic program of establishing a *German* Workers State. Fundamentally Marx and Engels viewed their theoretical system as a *German* set of ideas. Engels in the 1882 preface to *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific,* his fundamental theoretical work, stated: "But scientific socialism is indeed an essentially German product . . ." Having put a distinctly *German National* label on Marx's politico-economic structure, Engels "corrected" himself in a footnote. But with this "correction" he only pointed up the inherently *German* aims of Marx and his own. Instead of declaring that true scientific Socialism can never be a national product, Engels said "Scientific Socialism is not an *exclusively* German but just as much an international product." However, in other writings Engels did not even attempt to pretend that Marx's "scientific socialism" was not *exclusively* German. In his Prefatory Note to the *Peasant War in Germany* he asserted: "German scientific Socialism—the only scientific Socialism that ever existed."

When, after betraying the Paris workers, Marx inducted into the General Council several fugitives from the White Terror in France "as a tribute of respect for the Paris Commune" (Marx, *False Splits in the International),* these Frenchmen together with the English members bowed to Marx's "German science." This submission gave rise to some criticism, but Marx defended his and Engels' German supremacy: "Our crime, therefore, consists in the fact that the English and the French in the province of theory have submitted to the German element; but from this domination, which is the domination of German science, they do not suffer in the least and they even recognize this domination necessary." (Letter to Bolte, Nov. 23, 1871)

It is evident that Marx and Engels believed that the German element, that is they themselves, deserved to occupy a special place in the International: "the German element—and precisely thanks to Marx —occupies an influential place worthy of this element." (XIII, Pt. I, R. 321). There was really no limit to the German nationalist arrogance of Marx and Engels. Thus, one is led to imagine that the scientific exposition of the relations between the capitalists and the workers presented in *Capital* could never have been made with such thoroughness by a Frenchman, an Englishman, an American, a Russian, a Negro, a person of any nationality other than *German!* "The relation between capital and labor, the axis on which our entire present system of society turns, is here treated scientifically for the first time and with

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a thoroughness and acuity such as was possible only for a German." (*S. W.* I, 338)

Marx and Engels attached their national label even to dialectics merely because Hegel, whose mode of thinking they adopted, was a German. "Only by the subjection of the conditions produced in England and France to German dialectical criticism could a real result be achieved." (Engels, note to the Preface to the First Edition of *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific,* 1882; S. W. I, 137). "German dialectical method in its present state of elaboration is at least as superior to the old, shallow, garrulous metaphysical method as the railway is to the means of transport of the Middle Ages." (370). Although Marx lived in *England* most of his life and filled *Capital* with material and deductions based on capitalist relations in England, on English legislation and economic statistics, he and Engels regarded his work as a product not of England—certainly not of the world—but of *Germany:* "No matter what one's attitude toward Socialism, yet everybody will admit that here Socialism for the first time is expounded scientifically and that it was destined precisely for Germany to solve this question in the given domain." (XIII, Pt. I, R. 320)

2. *Marx and Engels Regard German Fatherland Above All Nations*

Germany was an obsession with Marx and Engels; *Germany* stood high above all the other countries and the Germans above the rest of mankind. "In all scientific spheres, the Germans have long since demonstrated their equality with, and in most of them their superiority over, the remaining civilized nations." (Engels, "On Karl Marx's Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," *S. W.* 1, 360). Writing about the prospective German emperor who, it was generally understood by the Marxists, some day would be overthrown by the workers and replaced with the German Marxist leaders of the International, Engels exclaimed with contempt: "And this is an emperor, and of the most enlightened nation in the world at that!" (Letter to Marx, Sept. 13, 1870. XXIV, R. 402). In his excessive German-nationalist arrogance Engels overlooked the fact, which he himself could have proved, that neither from the bourgeois nor from the proletarian point of view was Germany in 1870 "the most enlightened nation in the world."

Marx and Engels continually used German bourgeois chauvinism to prop up their German proletarian chauvinism: "Germany requires in the worst way that the world should look upon her again with respect; Bismarck and Moltke were able to bring about the situation wherein Germany is feared; but only our proletarians are able to conquer real respect." (Engels to Bebel, Oct. 29, 1884. XXVII, R. 421)

It is well to bear in mind that not long after they betrayed the Paris workers, Marx and Engels, for the first time in their political careers, acquired a solid basis within the German proletariat. It was a weird combination of circumstances, aided by their own policies,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which secured this basis for them: the military victory of the Prussian ruling caste, the creation of a powerful bourgeois Germany, the extirpation of the vanguard of the French proletariat, and the looting by Bismarck of the French Republic's treasury through the extortion of an extremely heavy contribution. Things went exactly as Marx and Engels had wished. The betrayal "paid off" handsomely: "The War of 1870-71 and the defeat of the Commune had transferred the centre of gravity of the European workers' movement for the time being from France to Germany, as Marx foretold. In France it naturally took years to recover from the blood-letting of May 1871. In Germany, on the other hand, where industry was, in addition, furthered (in positively hot-house fashion) by the blessing of the French milliards and developed more and more quickly, Social-Democracy experienced a much more rapid and enduring growth." (Engels, Intr. to the *Class Struggles in France, S. W.* II, 180)

It was this turbulent growth of German Social Democracy and of Marx's prestige in its ranks that made it easier for Marx and Engels to bear the tortured memory of the former humiliations of their German fatherland. In a letter to Mehring dated July 13, 1893, Engels wrote: "Since our workers have brought Germany into the front rank of the historical movement we can swallow the disgrace of the past rather more easily." It is plain that neither a patriot of some nation other than Germany, nor a true world proletarian revolutionist would be in any way pained over Germany's past national disgrace.

Non-German Marxists occasionally protested the nationalist arrogance of German burocrats, such as that of Herman Schleuter, who said: "We Germans speak from above down." (Cited by Eric Hass, *Socialism Answers Anti-Semitism*, 21-22). Regarding this nationalist arrogance an American Marxist Daniel De Leon wrote: ". . . there is a curious phenomenon that appears in our days, a phenomenon all the more curious because it appears in the Socialist camp—the phenomenon consists in the impudent presumption on the part of a certain element . . . to set itself up, as Germans, as superior to all other people, and, of course, as oracles of Socialism. . . . It can only tend to play into the capitalists' hand by tending to keep the nationalities of the land divided. . . . To the Socialist movement in particular, this abscess is dangerous; the movement's safety requires that it be lanced." (22-23)

That the German nationalist abscess within the proletarian movement was introduced by the founders of "Scientific Socialism," Marx and Engels, was passed over in silence. Here is another illustration of their strictly German outlook: "We attach a certain significance to our special situation of being representatives of *international* Socialism. This, however, does not allow us to belong to any distinct national party, at least until we return to Germany and participate directly in the struggle there." (Engels to Bernstein, Feb. 27, 1883)

The German workers, Engels boasted, were the most learned.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

And had it not been for the "German mind," Engels implied, humanity would never find its way out of Capitalism. "The German workers have two important advantages over those of the rest of Europe. First, they belong to the most theoretical people of Europe; they have retained that sense of theory which the so-called 'educated' people of Germany have completely lost. Without German philosophy which preceded it, particularly that of Hegel, German scientific socialism—the only scientific socialism that ever existed—would never have come into being." (Prefatory Note to *The Peasant War in Germany)*

Did Marx and Engels seek to win the workers away from the Utopians irrespective of nationality? No. It appears that Marx and Engels concentrated their efforts primarily on the *German* workers. And, in that manner, according to Marx, he and Engels achieved the result of lifting the German workers above the French and British: "*Utopian* Socialism especially, which for tens of years we have been clearing out of the German workers' heads with so much toil and labor —their freedom from it making them theoretically, and therefore practically, superior to the French and English—" (Marx to Sorge, October 19, 1877)

Engels died a fairly rich man. Part of his property he left to his niece, part to the former wife of Kautsky and to Marx's daughters. The rest he turned over, *not* to the *International,* which would have meant to foreign "comrades," above all, to the French, but to *German* Social Democracy.

3. *Marx's and Engels' Fear of a French Workers State Before the Commune*

The first indication of the life-long dream of Marx and Engels eventually to establish a German Workers State is found in the *Communist Manifesto,* at the inception of their political career in the camp of the proletariat. Although at that time they already recognized that in economic development England was far in advance of Germany and that in political evolution France, the traditional country of revolution, was ahead of both Germany and England, it was *Germany* that they singled out as the *chief* object of their attention on the eve of 1848 Revolution: "The Communists turn their attention chiefly to Germany, because that country is on the eve of a bourgeois revolution that is bound to be carried out under more advanced conditions of European civilization and with a much more developed proletariat than what existed in England in the 17th and in France in the 18th century, and because the bourgeois revolution in Germany will be but the prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution."

The 1848 June Days in Paris proved that France merited at least equal attention, if not more.

With the passage of time, despite all the confidence that they were nearing the fulfilment of their life's "mission," Marx and Engels ex-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

pected, or rather feared, that their advance would be cut short and their German-nationalist work frustrated by the sudden rise of a French Workers State. After Prussia's victory over Austria in a military struggle for German hegemony (1866), friction grew between Bismarck and Bonaparte, presaging war. Engels promptly perceived the danger of the French revolution. In a letter to Marx he expressed his apprehension: "I hope this abominable war will not come off, because I don't see what good can come from it. A French revolution with the apriori goal of securing conquests would be a very disagreeable thing." (April 27, 1867. XXIII, R. 408)

Two years before the Commune, Marx, with uncontrolled nationalist envy, observed a theoretical animation in Paris, a sign of preparations for large-scale revolutionary action. On March 3, 1869 he wrote to Kugelmann: "A very interesting movement is going on in France. The Parisians are making a regular study of their recent revolutionary past, in order to prepare themselves for the business in the impending new revolution." And commenting on the various political books in circulation and the ideological struggle raging in France, Marx, governed by his German feelings, exclaimed: "And so the whole historic witches' cauldron is bubbling. When shall *we* be so far!"

Three years before, Engels had made a comparison of the French and the German workers and had come to this correct conclusion: "The French proletariat as compared with the German is considerably more concentrated and has a more lengthy experience of struggle and organization." (XIII, Pt. I, R. 280). Yet, with this knowledge in mind, Marx and Engels privately felt that Germany must be placed ahead of France. Marx divulged this sentiment to Kugelmann on February 17, 1870, six months before the Franco-Prussian War: "Between ourselves —take all in all—I expect more for the social movement from Germany than from France." On what "materialist-dialectical" ground did Marx base this unscientific sentiment? Obviously on the emotional-nationalist ground of his "German Socialism." He knew that Germany was still behind France, that the workers of Berlin were almost provincials as compared with the workers of Paris. If Marx's political goal were not prompted by unscientific, reactionary, German-nationalist burocratic considerations he would have given Kugelmann a correct prognosis that, taking "all in all," in 1870 more could be expected in France than in Germany. So, combining his scientific understanding with his German-nationalist wishful thinking, Marx had written to Engels on February 12, 1870, a few days before writing to Kugelmann: "It is my firm conviction that, though the first impulse will come from France, Germany is far riper for a social movement and will outdistance France by far. The French are guilty of great error and self-deception if they still believe themselves to be the 'chosen people.'" (XXIV, R. 291). To Marx and Engels there was only one "chosen people," and it was certainly not the French.

On August 15, 1870, two weeks before the decisive battle of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Franco-Prussian War was fought at Sedan, Engels expressed to Marx the anxiety that if Germany lost the war "the German working class, at best, will become a mere appendage to the French." (381). Such an upshot would have shattered their fond dream of establishing German hegemony in all fields, including their ultimate goal, the formation of a German Workers State with Marx at its head. They realized that if the French workers put their leaders in power, the German proletariat would be subordinated to the French burocrats. In the eyes of Marx and Engels the question was who would establish a National Workers State first, they or the French. From every aspect it was imperative for Marx and Engels that bourgeois Germany win the war and the French working class become an appendage to the "German working class," more correctly, to its burocratic leaders, Marx and Engels. At bottom, it was this long-range perspective that impelled Marx and Engels to support Bismarck.

As we have seen, at the outbreak of the War Marx said privately to Engels that if Prussia were victorious the center of the working class movement would shift from France to Germany. When Prussia scored a definitive victory, Marx repeated this judgment in a letter to the Brunswick Committee. But he intended that this view was to be shared only among the German leaders and under no circumstances was it to be revealed to the French. The Brunswick leaders, however, failed to grasp this requirement of "German Socialism." Marx reported to Engels: "You know that I sent my instructions to Brunswick. . . . Well! These idiots not only print literally portions of my letter. They point at me as the author of the letter, and thereby *print* such parts as for instance the transfer of the center of the Continental workers movement from France to Germany, etc., which were to serve as inspiration but under no conditions were to be made known *now*. I ought to be thankful to them that they at least did *not* print my criticism of the French workers. And in addition to all this, these boys in hot haste send their compromising concoction to—Paris! (not to mention Brussels and Geneva). I'll give them a bawling out, but the folly has been committed." (Sept. 10, 1870. XXIV, R. 397-8)

Engels recognized the seriousness of the blunder Brunswick had committed by revealing Marx's German-nationalist sentiments. He promptly replied: "These asses in Brunswick! They were uneasy that you might be dissatisfied if they reworded the directives you sent them, so they cited them literally. In essence the only thing which is annoying is the point about the transfer of the center of weight. The printing of this is the acme of tactlessness. However, we may hope that the Parisians now have something else to do than to study that manifesto, especially since they don't know the German language." (Sept. 12, 1870, *Ib.* 399)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Engels Fearing the Rise of the French Workers State After the Commune*

Discussing the possible outcome of a general European war, Engels wrote to Bebel on November 17, 1885: "War, on the other hand, could bring about a revolution in Paris which then would give a strong indirect impetus to the movement in the rest of Europe; but then the leadership would fall into the hands of Frenchmen who in the given circumstance would be, unquestionably, in an extremely chauvinistic state of mind and who at their level of theoretical development are least prepared for this role."

Engels, thus, understood that the French would make a frontal assault on everything non-French in the proletarian camp once they secured power, just as Marx and he were prepared to do with everything non-German, once they secured power.

Watching the growing rapprochement between the Tsar and the French bourgeoisie, Engels was worried about Germany's safety; but, on the other hand, the developing Franco-Russian alliance had a positive aspect in his eyes. "Everything will be excellent: the alliance of France and Russia will compel the French to desist from any revolution whatsoever, because otherwise Russia will turn against her." (Letter to Sorge, Feb. 23, 1889. XXVIII, R. 88)

Another year goes by, Marx has long since passed away and Engels is nearing his own physical end. But Engels' thinking, as ever, runs in the channel of envisioning individual antagonistic proletarian countries. The French bourgeois republic is sinking in the morass of decay exemplified among other things by the gigantic Panama Canal swindle. Engels imagines that the end of the French bourgeoisie is at hand. Once again in his correspondence with the German Marxists there is detected fear that the French leaders will come to power first. And although Germany, in striking contrast to France, is at that time relatively quiet, Engels soothes himself with the subjective "reasoning" that even if a proletarian upheaval does occur in France, a Workers State will be formed *only* in his fatherland: "But the Panama affair all the same is the beginning of the end of the bourgeois Republic. . . . It is obvious that all this brings us considerably closer to the moment when our French comrades will become the only possible directors of the State. Only let's hope that this time does not arrive very soon, because our people in France are far from being mature for domination. . . . In any event the struggle, if it does break out in France too, will be brought to conclusion only in Germany." (Letter to Sorge, Dec. 31, 1892)

It is important to note that when Engels wrote this, the Marxist faction in France had just emerged as the dominant tendency within the French proletariat. Ten years earlier the anti-Marxist "Possibilists" in control of the National Committee of the French Workers Party had expelled the Marxists led by Guesde and Lafargue on the charge

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of obeying "the will of a person who is himself located in London outside all Party control." (Cited in *Sel. Cor.* 404). In a few years the Marxists consolidated their position, while the "Possibilists" disintegrated to such an extent that Engels was able to record: "At this time our comrades in France, particularly in Paris, are masters of the situation thanks to the split within the ranks of the Possibilists." (Letter to Sorge, April 8, 1891. XXVIII, R. 308)

It goes without saying that in the event of proletarian revolution either in France or in Germany Engels could have given it the necessary political guidance. He now commanded greater influence and respect than he and Marx had two decades before and during the Commune. Therefore, when Engels wrote to Sorge that "Our people in France are far from being mature for domination" he indicated that should an attempt to overthrow the French bourgeoisie take place he would repeat Marx's and his own tactic during the Commune and would withhold political guidance from "our people in France." And when he posed the possibility of "the moment when our French comrades will become the only possible directors of the State. Only let's hope that this time does not arrive very soon" he was in his own mind quite callously prepared to betray the French workers once again.

Engels knew that in political form France was far ahead of Germany: ". . . the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat can be carried to a conclusion only in a republic. If due to the favorable conditions, therefore, and the revolutionary past, the French overthrew Bonaparte and established the bourgeois republic, then they have the advantage over us who have not yet emerged from the mess of semi-feudalism and Bonapartism in that they already possess the form in which the struggle must be carried to conclusion (ausgekamft werden muss)—a form which we are yet to *conquer*. They are ahead of us politically by a whole stage." (Engels to Bernstein, Aug. 27, 1883. XXVII, R. 326-7). So when Engels, at the time Germany was still a monarchy, stated that "In any event the struggle, if it does break out in France too, will be brought to conclusion only in Germany" he indicated that he intended to give full political guidance only to the German Marxists, although Bebel and Liebknecht were in nowise more advanced in theory and practice than Guesde and Lafargue.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MARXISM AND THE BOLSHEVIK STATE

Workers Democratic World Government

VERSUS

National-Burocratic 'Soviet' and Capitalist Regimes

VOLUME FOUR

Anti- Semitism and Left Christianism in the Marxist System

Digitized by Google

Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I.

THE PLEKHANOV-LENIN BETRAYAL OF THE 1905 REVOLUTION ON ANTI-SEMITIC GROUNDS

1. *The 1905 General Strike and the Tsar's Manifesto*

THE YEAR 1905 began with a serious ferment among the masses of Russia. On Sunday, January 22 (9) in St. Petersburg, workers, their wives and children, carrying icons and chanting *God Save the Tsar,* led by a priest, Gapon, marched to the Winter Palace to petition the Tsar for measures against oppression and poverty. There were over two hundred thousand people in the procession and their intentions were peaceful. But the Tsar's Army met them with bullets, killing 1,216 and wounding nearly 5,000. The brutal massacre electrified all of Russia—workers, students, the Liberal bourgeoisie, and it shook the morale of the Navy and the Army. In the villages insurrectionary outbreaks, which had been sporadic, now rapidly grew in number and violence.

The mainstay of the Tsar's power had always been the Army, but by June 1905 he could no longer fully rely on it. This became evident during the numerous strikes and barricade fights which took place in the Spring and Summer. Lenin wrote in July: "The Army began to waver. At first isolated cases of insubordination, outbreaks among the reservists, protests of officers, agitation among the soldiers, refusal of some companies or regiments to shoot at their brother-workers. Then the *passing of a section of the Army to the side of the uprising." (C. W.* VI, R. 266; *S. W.* III, 311)

In the Summer and Autumn, Soviets, originated primarily by the Mensheviks, sprang up in Ivanovo-Vosnesensk, Kharkov, Kiev, Kostroma, Moscow, St. Petersburg and other cities. The Mensheviks, with whom the Bolsheviks and other Marxists collaborated, initiated a general strike through the All-Russian Railway Union. "The strike movement of the workers, bearing primarily a political character, expanded and grew not by the day but by the hour and terminated in the great October general strike." (Zinoviev, I, R. 23, 24). The general strike assumed proportions never before witnessed in history; simultaneously, signs that the Tsar could hardly rely on his Army continued to multiply. On several occasions his generals were compelled to withdraw their troops to prevent a complete collapse of military discipline. (Lenin, *Proletari,* Oct. 25, 1905. *C. W.* VI, R. 538)

On October 30 (17), ten days after the general strike began, the Tsar issued a Manifesto promising "To grant the population the unshakable foundations of civil liberty on the principles of true inviolability of person, freedom of conscience, speech, assembly and unions." The Manifesto carried a pledge to establish a constitutional monarchy. The world bourgeoisie presented the situation as the end of the centuries' old autocratic rule of the Tsars. The correspondent

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the London *Times* stated: "The people are victorious. The Tsar has capitulated. Autocracy has ceased to exist." (Retrans. from Rus.). The French Rightist bourgeois *Temps* wrote lugubriously: "Unfortunately, it is very clear that the affair has really gone far and that the Government had no other way out of the blind alley into which it was driven. Let us then forget quickly about the character of this capitulation—a capitulation not only to the constitutionalists, people of moderate politics, who should have been heeded in the first place, but a capitulation to the strike, capitulation to the Revolution." And Lenin wrote on the day after the publication of the Manifesto: "The revolutionary proletariat has succeeded in neutralizing the Army, paralyzing it in the great days of the general strike. It must now succeed in winning the Army completely to the side of the people. The revolutionary proletariat has brought the city revolution to the first great victory. It must now broaden and deepen the base of the Revolution by spreading it to the village." *(C. W.* VI, R. 541)

2. *The Tsar's Chief Tactic in 1905: Anti-Jewish Pogroms*

As history subsequently established, the Tsar's Manifesto was not a sign of a victory for the Revolution. When the Manifesto was issued, the revolutionary workers, students and professional elements led by the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks and SRs jubilantly gathered in the central parts of the cities to celebrate their "victory" over the autocracy. They read and re-read the Manifesto embracing and kissing. Many wept with joy. Among the oppressed non-Russian nationalities, the Jews, in certain respects, were happier than others, for they had been treated far more harshly by the Tsar than any other national or social group.

A frontal assault upon the Revolution was totally ruled out, and the Tsar for the moment made no attempts in that direction. He resorted to a tactic which would seem unrelated to his struggle against the Russian masses—anti-Jewish pogroms. While the "victory" was being celebrated with mammoth parades, red flags, speechmaking and singing, the Tsar's agents, called the Black Hundreds, and the police who had recruited hooligans and criminal elements all over the country, gave the signal for attacking the Jews: "The sentiment which the first victory of the revolution aroused among the wide masses of the population soon—in some places on the same day the 'Manifesto' wrested from Tsarism was published—was darkened by savage pogroms. . . . The pogrom tide rolled over the entire south, south-west and center of Russia and reached the Caucasus on one side and Siberia on the other." (Kirzhnits, *1905 Materials and Documents, Jewish Workers Movement,* R. 212)

The revolutionary crowds vanished from the streets. The police, previously driven into hiding by the workers, were now deliberately kept away by the Tsarist authorities, and at times the pogromists were in complete control of the cities. In some places the Tsarist officials

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

made sham gestures of halting the pogroms. During the pogrom week, many backward workers participated in the numerous pro-Tsarist patriotic parades. In Kazan, for example: "On the 22 of October there were demonstrations of thousands of 'patriots' with portraits of the Tsar, icons, tri-colored flags, placards with legends: 'For the Tsar' and 'God Save the Tsar.' The crowd included not only merchants, landlords, and similar elements, but also a considerable number of the most ignorant workers of Krestovnik and of other mills and factories." (*Prol. Revolutsia,* #3 (15), 1923, 132). "The students, the Jewish population, seized with panic, fled from Kazan en mass. Party functionaries too began to depart." (135). Unquestionably, then, due to the pogrom tactic, the day of the Tsar's Manifesto was one of great success for the autocracy and of great defeat for the Revolution.

3. *The Marxists and Liberals Aware of Pogrom Preparations*

The Black Hundreds did not hide their preparations for the pogroms: "And indeed, everybody knew beforehand of the forthcoming pogroms. Proclamations calling for pogroms were distributed. Bloodthirsty articles appeared in the official provincial news reports; sometimes special newspapers were issued. All this secret Government apparatus was set in motion in the famous October days,—'the days of freedom.' The people who were celebrating the 'granting of the Manifesto' had not yet cleared the streets, when here and there small groups began to appear, talking about pogroms and in some places already beginning isolated attacks. Tsarism revenged itself for its humiliation. The October pogroms swept all of Russia." (I. Kogan, *Pogroms in the Days of Freedom,* R. 10)

Trotsky, an outstanding leader of the 1905 Revolution, president of the St. Petersburg Soviet, also testifies that *everybody* knew that the Tsar would employ the pogrom tactic: "Everybody knows in advance about the approaching pogrom. Pogrom proclamations are being distributed, bloodthirsty articles appear in the official *Gubernsky Vedomosti,* at times a special paper is issued. The Odessa city Mayor put out a provocative proclamation in his own name." (II, Pt. II, R. 43)

Russia had had previous experience with this Tsarist tactic: "The pogroms were no news. The upsurge in the Russian revolutionary movement was always accompanied by pogroms. They were used by the Government as a lightning rod for the popular resentment." (Kogan, 4)

Although Tsarism had consistently used the Jewish pogrom as a diverting political tactic whenever the proletarian and peasant struggles mounted in intensity, somehow the Marxist and Left bourgeois elements always disregarded the ominous signs of the forthcoming pogroms. As a result, the victim of the Tsar's tactic, the Jewish masses and Jewish bourgeoisie, were lulled into a false sense of security, imagining that the Black Hundrdes might not resort to new pogroms.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Bund, a Jewish Marxist organization, after the Kishinev pogrom (April 19-20, 1903), took physical measures to repel future attacks on the Jewish population. They trained armed detachments and tried to stop the pogroms which swept Gomel, Lodz, Tiraspol and other cities in May-June 1903. Yet by 1905, the crucial year, they evinced complete lack of vigilance. One of the Bund's leaders, describing the Zhitomir pogrom (April 24-26, 1905), admits that they were caught napping: "True, we knew that the Black Hundred were being organized and proclamations were being distributed calling for an attack on the Jews, that some persons received threatening letters, but all this in the last half year had become such a common and universal phenomenon that we did not attach special significance to these facts. . . ." (Bund's *Poslednie Novosti* #233)

4. *Jewish Selfdefense—an Ineffective Tactic*

The Bund Selfdefense was joined by a handful of advanced non-Jewish workers, peasants and a small student militia of mixed nationalities. The wretchedly armed defenders would attempt to stop the pogromists who usually found protection behind the guns of the most backward Army units: "The student militia and the Jewish Selfdefense attempted to stop the pogroms but with no success. The troops would not allow the militia to go into the streets where the pogrom was raging. A near-by officer would give the command followed by a volley and the militia-men would fall wounded by the soldiers' bullets. The troops were shooting only into the Selfdefense groups and medical corps; they did not molest the hooligans." (I. Kogan, 10)

The Jewish bourgeoisie, too, sent armed units into the streets to fight the pogromists. The organization of the bourgeois Jewish Selfdefense had been launched immediately after Kishinev: "In the Summer of 1903 the Jewish bourgeoisie in all the cities of the 'pale' organized national 'Committees of Selfdefense,' armed them in order to counteract the pogroms, not fearing the necessity of armed struggle against the police." (Rafes, *Sketches on the History of the "Bund,"* R.)

In its own way the Jewish bourgeoisie was determined to resist the pogromists. Levin, a Jewish bourgeois representative in the First Duma, declared: "Gentlemen, this was after the notorious Kishinev pogrom, after Pleve's notorious circular forbidding the Jews to form units of Selfdefense . . . I was a rabbi then . . . in Ekaterinoslav. The Governor called me in and told me of the circular received from Pleve . . . I told him that if the pogromists attacked my wife and my child then no kind of circulars of the Ministers would stop me from firing a bullet in their head and if worse came to worst to die with them. Only then did we organize units of Jewish Selfdefense. I must state, Gentlemen, that we ourselves strove not to lend a party character to the Selfdefense." (State Duma, First Convocation, *Sten. Report*, 1906, II, R. 1743)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

It is clear that in setting up their Selfdefense on a non-political basis, the Jewish capitalists made it purely Jewish in character and a matter of sheer physical resistance to the Tsar's *political* tactic. The very form of protection was objectively an aid to the Tsar's tactic. The Jewish character of the Selfdefense lent credence to the Black Hundreds' propaganda that the struggle in Russia was not between the Russian people and the Tsar but between the Jews and the Russian people led by the Tsar.

The Selfdefense was ineffective from every angle. It led only to the massacre of a number of selfsacrificing fighters. To the Jewish population the utter inability of the Selfdefense to stand up against the regular Army units, Cossacks, the police and the pogromists was obvious. In utter despair the victims appealed for protection to the Tsarist authorities, the very organizers of the pogroms. The Tsarist Mayor of Odessa reported to the Minister of Interior: "When on the third day I visited all the places of the pogroms, the population, hiding within the gates of the buildings, ran towards me, pleading for the return of police protection." *(Materials on the History of Russian Counter-Revolution,* I, R, 199). Trotsky described the pathetic wretchedness of the pogrom victims: "Others fall to their knees before the officers, before the pogromists and the police, extend hands in supplication, crawl in the dust, kiss the boots of the soldiers, imploring for help." (II, Pt. II, R. 45)

Thus, both from the political aspect as well as from the aspect of physical protection of the pogrom-victims the Selfdefense, in itself, was no measure to stop the Tsar.

5. *The First Result: The Collapse of the General Strike*

When the Tsar issued his Manifesto the first reaction of the St. Petersburg Soviet was to declare with confidence that the great strike would grow to an armed attack on the Government. "The revolutionary strike continues. There is no retreat for the people. Ahead looms a violent struggle." *(Izvestia* of the Soviet of Workers Deputies, Oct. 18 (31), 1905. Trotsky, III, Pt. I, R. 280). But with the appalling spectacle of Jewish pogroms the workers became bewildered. They sensed that the Tsar, whom they had believed to be at the mercy of the Revolution, was free to commit outrages while the Revolution stood by completely impotent. The strike suddenly ebbed and the workers drifted back to the factories. The Revolution, instead of moving to a higher stage, from a general political strike to a general uprising, made a marked retreat. Yielding to the changed mood of the masses, the leadership of the St. Petersburg Soviet, to avoid embarrassment, called off the general strike. Trotsky wrote the announcement in his usual dramatic phrases: "Taking into account the need for the working class, utilizing the achieved victories, to organize itself in the most efficient manner and arm itself for the final

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

struggle for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly on the principle of general, equal, direct and secret electoral rights and for the establishment of a Democratic Republic, the Soviet of Workers Deputies resolves: to terminate the general political strike at noon on the 21 of October, in order, depending on the events, to resume it at the first call of the Soviet for further struggle for our demands just as unitedly as heretofore." (*Izvestia* of the Soviet of Workers Deputies. Oct. 20 (Nov. 2), 1905. Trotsky, III, Pt I, R. 280)

The Tsar through his pogrom tactic actually disrupted the strike. The true chronology of the retreat of the workers was: "From the 18 the strike loses its direct combat character. It becomes transformed into a colossal demonstration of lack of confidence. But the province, which entered the struggle before the capital, goes back to work. On the 19 the strike is ended in Moscow. The Petersburg Soviet resolves to terminate the strike on the 21 of October at 12 noon." (Trotsky, II, Pt II, R. 37)

6. *The Decline of the Revolution*

The pogroms lasted about a week but they left a deep impression on the masses, although the full import of what had occurred was not clear to them. Since the Tsar had not made a frontal assault on the Revolution, the Marxists and Liberals picked up where they had left off on the day of the Manifesto, with meetings and speechmaking. However the Revolution lacked the previous spirit. Large sections of the population which had enthusiastically participated in the general strike were now apathetic. The Marxists attempted to rekindle the spirit but the masses were retreating, while the Tsar, supported by the big bourgeoisie, was now on the offensive despite the noisy shouting of the Marxists. When in November 1905 the St. Petersburg Soviet, under Trotsky's guidance, "decreed" an eight-hour work day, the big bourgeoisie locked out tens of thousands of workers in the capital. The St. Petersburg workers were further demoralized by this blow. Four weeks before, they had felt that they were masters of the situation and left the factories in an exultant militant mood, confident in their own strength and buoyed up by the panic of the Government and the bourgeoisie. Now it was no longer the Tsar and the bourgeoisie but they and the Soviet that were hard pressed. The Soviet issued impassioned appeals to the masses but even in its fiery verbiage the reversed relationship between the Tsar's Government and the masses was clearly evident.

The Tsar and the bourgeoisie contemptuously ignored the Soviet's imperious order that the workers be rehired. Thereupon the Soviet again retreated behind a cloud of brave words and withdrew the eight-hour day "decree." The workers, now allowed by the bourgeoisie to return to their jobs, naturally experienced a new sense of defeat.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

7. *Ultra-Left Adventurism*

Falling back before the onslaught of the Tsar's Government, the Revolution left behind a trail of desultory ultra-Leftist putsches, the suppression of which helped to consolidate the power of the Tsar. On November 8, (October 26) a group of Kronstadt sailors mutinied. The Tsar injected the pogrom tactic into this uprising: on the next day "to the movement were attached police-led hooligans who wrecked the wine shops of the city and began a regular pogrom." (Lenin, *C. W.* VII, Pt II, R. Notes 225). This move served to disorganize the sailors and they were easily subdued.

On November 24, (11) 1905 in Sevastopol the Black Sea sailors on the battleship *Ochakov* and on a few lesser craft rose under a "non-party Socialist" Lieutenant Schmidt. But the uprising lasted only four days. Land batteries loyal to the Tsar opened fire on the insurgents, sinking two ships, the *Svirepi* and the *Bug,* and setting the battleship afire. Many sailors were shot. Schmidt was taken prisoner and executed on March 6, 1906. "The liquidation of the Sevastopol uprising untied the hands of the Witte-Durnovo Government which began to prepare openly for a decisive battle against the proletariat." *(Ib.)*

Isolated strikes continued but they were not conducted with the revolutionary fervor of the pre-Manifesto period. Even the so-called "great strike of the postal-telegraph employes" (Lenin) proved a tremendous fiasco. "The strike of the postal-telegraph employees was decided on November 15 . . . At the beginning of December the strike died out from the exhaustion of the workers and was liquidated in conjunction with the failure of the December All-Russian political strike." (227). The struggle in Poland, too, was ebbing: "From the middle of November 1905 a certain fatigue was already observed in the Polish proletariat." *(Prol. Revolutsia,* #12, 1923, 320)

But the Marxists completely disregarded every sign of the decline of the Revolution. They obeyed but one impulse: ultra-Leftism. "The victors of Sevastopol hardly have a reason to rejoice," wrote Lenin three days after the arrest of Lieutenant Schmidt. "The uprising of the Crimea has been defeated. The uprising of Russia is undefeatable." *(C. W.* VII, Pt I, R. 31). The autocracy was crushing the workers in strikes and battles but Lenin wrote "The autocracy is already too impotent to defeat the Revolution . . ." (30)

Making light of every new victory of the Tsar, Lenin, with Leftist recklessness, urged the proletariat to march forward in a head-on collision with the armed forces of the State. Trotsky, making a show of romantic bravado, defiantly shouted to the Tsarist police and generals: "Go ahead and dare! Disband all workers' trade unions! Disperse the clubs! Suppress the revolutionary press! Do not stop half way! Go to the end! First arrest all the instigators, then crush all organizations, and finally, strangle the people. Dare, you hangmen!

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Revolution is calmly awaiting your final attack." *(Russkaya Gazeta,* Dec. 15 (2), 1905, III, Pt I, 304). The Tsar proceeded to do just that. He instituted martial law in many provinces. The Buro of the Postal-Telegraph Union and the Buro of the Peasant Congress were seized as was the Chairman of the St. Petersburg Soviet, Khrustalev. And when Trotsky replaced him, the entire personnel of the Soviet, including Trotsky, was arrested. At this point the Bolsheviks went completely berserk. "In reply to this, the Moscow Bolsheviks and the Moscow Soviet of Workers' Deputies which they led, and which was connected with the broad masses of the workers, decided to make immediate preparations for armed uprising." *(Hist. of C.P.S.U.,* 82). The Mensheviks, the Jewish Bund and other Marxist tendencies, including the SRs, supported the Bolsheviks in the wild-putschist enterprise. It was decided to call a political general strike. As could have been predicted by any level-headed perspicacious and honest political leader, the strike was a complete failure even in the leading center of the Revolution, St. Petersburg: "The December strike in Petersburg was announced on December 4 at the united meeting of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in reply to the offensive action on the part of the Government of Witte-Durnovo (the prison decree on strikes December 2, arrest of the Soviet of Workers Deputies, etc.); a similar decision was taken at the session of the Executive Committee of the reestablished Soviet of Workers Deputies on December 4. But the Petersburg proletariat, fatigued by the two preceding strikes, reacted feebly to the decisions of the leading Party centers and of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, and the strike was soon liquidated." (Lenin, *C. W.* VII, Pt II, R. Notes, 231)

Yet, despite nonsupport from the St. Petersburg workers who represented the most advanced section of the Russian proletariat, and despite the utter lack of response to the strike-call in the provinces, the Marxists carried out their suicidal ultra-Leftist adventure, the famous Moscow uprising, which was doomed from the outset, as the Stalin historians admit: "The political strike started in Moscow on December 7 (20). However, efforts to spread it to the whole country failed; it met with inadequate support in St. Petersburg, and this reduced the chances of success of the uprising from the very outset. The Nikolayevskaya (now the October) Railway remained in the hands of the Tsarist Government. Traffic on this line was not suspended, which enabled the Government to transfer regiments of the Guard from St. Petersburg to Moscow for the suppression of the uprising. In Moscow itself the garrison vacillated. The workers had begun the uprising partly in expectation of receiving support from the garrison. But the revolutionaries had delayed too long, and the Government managed to cope with the unrest in the garrison." *(Hist. of C.P.S.U.* 82-3)

The very fact that the railroad workers transported troops sent by the Tsar to suppress the uprising is a measure of the isolation

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Moscow proletarian vanguard and of the criminal irresponsibility of the Bolshevik, Menshevik, SR and the Bund leaderships. "Everybody was awaiting news from Petersburg. It was received at last but not what had been expected. The strike in Petersburg was a fizzle; an armed uprising to aid Moscow could not be thought of. The situation of the Moscow proletariat was becoming frightful. Isolated from all the rest of the proletarian centers, it continued the struggle. Blood was literally flowing in streams. The soldiers made sport of 'the guilty and the innocent'—of those who took part in the fighting and the accidental passers-by, killing many on the spot. The flames from the barricades fired by the soldier lighted up the field of the massacre." *(Proletarskaya Rev.* #12, 1923, 324-5)

Lenin's own retrospective survey of the basic features of the uprising shows the shocking ultra-Left adventurism of the Marxists: "The fighters were few, the working masses did not receive a slogan of daring attacks and did not apply it, the character of the partisan detachments was too narrow, their arms and methods inadequate, their ability to lead a crowd virtually undeveloped." *(Proletari,* August 29, 1906; *C. W.* VII, Pt II, R. 52). With an air of self-criticism Lenin made a few admissions which only emphasized the tactic of ultra-Leftism of the Marxist leadership: "In declaring the strike, all the revolutionary parties, all the Moscow unions, sensed and even realized that it must inevitably grow into an uprising. On December 19 (6) the Soviet of Workers' Deputies resolved to 'strive to transform the strike into an armed uprising.' As a matter of fact, however, none of the organizations were prepared for this . . . In December 1905, we, the leaders of the Social-Democratic proletariat, behaved like a commander-in-chief who had arranged the disposition of his troops in such an absurd way that most of them remained out of action." ("Lessons of the Moscow Uprising," *S. W.* III, 346, 348). With this "self-criticism" Lenin covered up the fact that the trouble was not the bad disposition of the "troops" of the proletariat but the *lack* of "troops": "The actual number of fighters was small: about 2,000 were armed out of a total number of 8,000, who, according to Lenin, took active part in the struggle (armed and unarmed)." *(Ib.* "Ex. N.," 529) The Stalin historians, without revealing the real culprits who perpetrated this ultra-Leftist Marxist crime against the workers, wrote "And so the December rising was crushed thanks to the absence of organization of the proletarian masses, absence of ideological guidance, split up of forces, their remoteness from the Party centers which on their part suffered from lack of a single plan and identical attitude toward the affair by both fractions of the Party." *(Prolet. Revolutsia,* #4, 1927, 69-70)

The vanguard Moscow workers, misled by their Marxist leaders into a trap, were massacred by the Tsar's artillery; the captured were bayoneted or shot by the soldiers of the "Dying autocracy" as Lenin

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

had falsely described the Tsar's growing power two weeks before. (*Novaia Zhisn,* Dec. 6, (Nov. 23), 1905; VII, Pt I, R. 35)

8. *The Tsar's Repressive and Ideological Drive Against the Revolution*

Immediately after suppressing the Moscow ultra-Left adventure, the Tsar launched an all-out attack on the masses: "1906. January. Work of punitive expeditions all over Russia, especially in the Baltic territories (Orlov, Meller-Zakomelsky) in the Caucasus (Alikhanov Avarsky) and in Siberia (Rennenkampf), the shattering of professional organizations, trade unions, revolutionary and oppositional press." ("Table of Events," Lenin, VII, Pt II, R. 15). At the same time the anti-Jewish propaganda continued unabated for the purpose of maintaining the disorientation of the masses. The story told and retold to workers, soldiers, peasants, even to children in schools was that the Jewish capitalists had conspired with the revolutionists to seize Russia and to enslave the Russian people. One widely-circulated pamphlet *The Russians and the Jews in Our Revolution,* referred to two Jewish bourgeois deputies in the State Duma, Vinaver and Hertsenstein, and asserted: "The Vinavers and Hertsensteins led the entire Duma to a complete break with the Tsar towards transformation of Russia into a Jewish republic in which the Jews-capitalists would be masters while the Russians would be turned into beasts of burden." (12; Cited in *Gr. Sov. Enc.* III, 74). The class-conscious workers who participated in strikes or fought on the barricades were called gullible dupes of the Jews: "All the *real, dangerous, sinister power of our revolution* belongs to the Jews who seek 'equality' out of purely rapacious motives and draw into their ranks the light-minded, ignorant Russians, enticing them with unrealizable dreams and with the tangible reality of Jewish gold." (15). Nor was the Russian Jewish bourgeoisie alone in the supposed sinister plot: "The foreign Jewish capitalists gave them millions for the Russian Revolution so that *within a year* it should culminate in equality for the Jews to enable them in the next year to extort in return these millions from the Russian people caught in the Jewish clutches." (13-14)

The Black Hundred propagandists fired the Polish masses with anti-Semitism, painting "the Jews as the chief cause of the downfall of Poland." (Kaluzhsky, *Who Are the Worst Enemies of the Christian Nations, Particularly Russia,* Jan. 1906)

The Tsar thus advanced against the masses with direct repressive measures under the anti-Semitic ideological cloak.

9. *Plekhanov's "Criticism" and "Self-criticism"*

While dealing powerful blows to the masses and the Marxist organizations, the autocracy was making ready to convoke the State Duma, "the first Russian parliament." With the failure of the Moscow

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

putsch, two divergent views on tactics crystallized within the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party. Lenin was against utilizing the Duma for propaganda purposes. His line still was armed uprising! "The Mensheviks say: Our Party must participate in the election of representatives and electors. The Bolsheviks say: Active boycott of the Duma . . . Down with the Duma! Down with the new police swindle! Citizens! Honor the memory of the fallen Moscow heroes by a new preparation for an armed uprising!" (VII, Pt I, R. 57, 59). Many years later in his pamphlet *Left Communism: An Infantile Disorder* Lenin "self-criticised" one part of his adventurist 1905-6 policy: "The boycott of the Duma by the Bolsheviks in 1906 was a mistake." But he never admitted that the Moscow putsch and his call for a new uprising were ultra-Leftism.

Plekhanov, a leading figure of the Menshevik Marxists, went further than Lenin in "self-criticism." In a seemingly honest endeavor to determine the cause of the decline of the Revolution, Plekhanov quite logically and correctly pointed out the difference in strength between the general strike before the Tsar's Manifesto and the strike after: "The October general strike produced a shocking impression both in Russia and abroad. This was advantageous for the proletariat in general and for the cause of political freedom in particular. But this was 'obligatory.' In order to produce a *similarly* powerful impression the second general strike should have been *incomparably more grandiose than the first.* It turned out differently. The second strike was considerably weaker than the first. As a consequence it produced an impression unfavorable to the proletariat." ("Dnevnik Sotsial-Democrata, #4, Dekabr 1905." Plekhanov, XV, R. 5)

Plekhanov's conclusion was "We should not have resorted to arms." This mild understatement was as far as Plekhanov went. Had he given a political explanation of the Moscow putsch he would have implicated not only the Bolsheviks but also the Mensheviks, himself as well. However, one thing which Plekhanov did indicate was that after the October strike the Revolution was on the downgrade. Yet he did not analyze the cause of the turn, the Tsar's pogrom tactic which had cracked the morale of the masses. He indirectly admitted that the Party had not counteracted this tactic, having failed to spread enlightenment on the subject of anti-Semitism. A few weeks after Moscow, in a letter to a "Comrade X," he wrote: "Of whom are the 'Black Hundreds' composed? Aren't there representatives of the proletariat in their ranks? Who was massacring the 'Zhids'? Only professional thieves and drunkards? Alas, no! I myself could name several places where even factory *workers* marched together with the pogromists. It is clear, therefore, that up to the present there are many proletarians who have not yet become imbued with the revolutionary ideology and who are ready to support the old order against their most basic interests. We Social-Democrats should have immediately and energetically started to enlighten these backward layers of the prole-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tariat. Therein lay one of the most important tasks of the current moment. The more energetically, and therefore the more successfully, we had begun that work the more resolute and impressive would have been our reply to the reactionary provocations. I ask you, Comrade, did we do everything we could and ought to have done in that respect? I think we did not." (6)

Plekhanov is saying in effect that the Social Democrats did not do everything they *should have* and *could have done* to defend the Revolution. The culpability of the Marxist leaders is underscored by the fact that they had been fully aware of the need to enlighten the masses on the subject of anti-Semitism. In 1903 at the Second Congress of the Party none other than Plekhanov himself drew up a resolution on the matter: "Plekhanov's Resolution on Anti-Jewish Pogroms: 'In view of the fact that movements such as the sadly notorious Kishinev pogrom, besides being of repulsive savagery, serve in the hands of the police as a means whereby it attempts to stem the growth of the class-consciousness of the proletariat, the Congress recommends that comrades use all the means at their disposal for struggle against such movements and for clarifying the proletariat regarding the reactionary and class essence of the Anti-Semitic and all the other nationalchauvinist instigations." *(Sec. Cong. R.S.D. Labor Party, July-August, 1903,* R. Moscow, 1932, 411)

During the two years between the unanimous adoption of the Plekhanov Resolution and the Tsar's October 1905 wholesale application of the pogrom tactic, "the pogroms became a permanent 'feature' of the autocracy." (Kogan, 5). The pogromists assured the masses that the Revolution was Jewish. Yet Plekhanov and the other Marxist leaders violated the Resolution of the Second Congress and made no serious effort to enlighten the masses or the Social Democratic workers on the political and historical essence of anti-Semitism.

10. *The Strange Omissions at the Unification Congress*

On April 23 (10), 1906, in Stockholm, the Russian Marxists gathered at the Fourth Congress of their Party, the first official gathering since the Revolution of 1905. At this Unification Congress the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks fused organizationally and to a large extent politically. Meeting after the most stupendous events in the history of the Russian Empire, after the greatest proletarian upheaval since 1871, the Bolshevik and Menshevik leaders of the proletariat avoided reviewing both their own recent policies and those of the Tsar and drawing the much-needed lessons. Even the national question, which included the Tsar's pogrom tactic, the problem of analyzing the political nature of Anti-Semitism and the issue of protection of the Jewish victims was kept off the agenda. The "Project of Condition of Unity of the Bund with the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party" stated: "The question of the national program remains

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

open since it was not taken up by the Unification Congress." (Cited in Lenin's VII, Pt II, R. 200)

11. *The Social Democratic Fraction in the Duma and the Belostok Pogrom*

Dominated by the Mensheviks the Unification Congress resolved not to boycott the Duma elections. Meanwhile the elections took place and a number of Social Democrats won seats and formed a fraction in the State Duma. The Marxist Fraction was led by the Mensheviks Ramishvili and Djaparidze.

The Revolution, though receding, still simmered in the cities and the villages and the Tsar continued the policy of pogrom incitement. In June 1906 a savage massacre of the Jewish population was staged in the city of Belostok. An interpellation about this outrage was introduced in the Duma. The Secretary of the Duma read:

"In the city of Belostok on 1 of June began a pogrom against the Jewish population accompanied by bloody acts. The population in horror is appealing to the State Duma for aid, fearing that the local authorities and vicious agitation might attempt to present the victims as the instigators of the misfortune that has befallen them, as has happened innumerably with the other pogroms . . . Already a rumor has been spread, which turned out to be an invention, that a bomb was thrown into a Corpus Christi procession." (State Duma, First Conv., *St. Rep.* 1906, II, 952)

As with other pogroms, the Belostok pogrom was no surprise: "The pogrom had been assiduously prepared through agitation for two weeks. In the streets, especially in the evenings, proclamations had been distributed calling for the beating up not only of the Jews but also of the intelligentsia. The police condoned these preparations." (Telegram of Elector of Belostok, Tsirin. Cited by Lenin in *Vpered* of June 4, 1906; VII, Pt I, R. 300). And Lenin commented: "The old, familiar picture! The police prepare the pogrom in advance. The police do the instigating; in the Government print-shops are printed appeals to massacre the Jews." *(Ib.)*. But what were the leading Marxists doing about all this? Belostok boasted of a considerable Marxist movement but, as ever, it was caught off guard.

Regarding the interpellation, Lenin wrote: "The State Duma acted very well when it brought up the interpellation about the Belostok pogrom for immediate discussion and dispatched members of the State Duma to investigate the case on the spot." *(Ib.)*. However, Lenin was silent about the strange fact that the Social Democratic Fraction of the Duma took no initiative in raising the question of the Belostok pogrom. The main cry about the pogrom was raised by the Cadet Deputies, Gentiles and Jews, though none of them went beyond making charges, buttressed by substantiating evidence, that

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Tsarist authorities engineered the pogrom. This the Tsarist authorities did not particularly deny.

The Marxist Deputies confined their participation in the Duma debate on Belostok to a few remarks not basically different from those uttered by the Liberal representatives. The behavior of the Marxists, which was strange to begin with, was finally marked by an astounding proposal. In the midst of the discussion on the Belostok pogrom, with dozens of names still on the speakers' list, the Marxists made a motion *to close the discussion and pass to the next order of business.* The formula they offered for the termination of the debate was a revolting mockery of the whole issue. Instead of favoring a policy of providing the masses with enlightenment on anti-Semitism, they proposed that the masses *themselves* combat this ideological force. The Marxists also called upon the Tsar's troops to guard the Jews against his pogromists. The formula was read by Djaparidze: " 'In the name of the Social-Democratic Fraction I propose the following formula of passing to the next order of business: . . . 1) to dispatch members of the State Duma to the places which are most threatened with the serious danger of pogroms; 2) to call upon the population to resist the national incitement fanned by the enemies of the people and to struggle for a full equality of all nationalities; 3) to remind the soldiers and officers regarding their duty to defend the population from attacks by armed bands, and 4) to brand before the entire Russian people with the stigma of shame all those guilty of perpetrating the Belostok pogrom, convinced that the people's justice will not pass by these criminals and their protectors. The State Duma is passing to the next order of business.' (Applause from the Left)." (State Duma, First Conv. *Sten. Rep.* 1906, II, R. 1825-6. Session July 12, (June 29) 1906). This move was direct support to the bourgeois Deputies and even to the Tsar's Ministers who were anxious to dismiss the issue. Soon Belostok passed into the limbo of half-forgotten events.

12. *The Fifth Congress*

"In 1907, after the Revolution of 1905 had been smashed, the last Social Democratic Congress attended by the 'Mensheviks' and the 'Bolsheviks' was held in London. Of the 305 delegates the 'Bolsheviks' had 105, the Mensheviks 97 and the Bundovists (the Jewish Union) 57." *(Kalendar Kommunista na 1924,* 241). The remaining delegates represented the Polish and Lettish Social-Democratic organizations. *(Hist. of C.P.S.U.* 90). An outstanding feature at the Congress (held May 13-June 1) was the Report of the Social Democratic Fraction of the Duma, and the discussion and resolution on the Report adopted by the Congress.

The chief critics of the Fraction were the leaders of the Jewish Bund. They seemed especially bitter because it was their political "friends," the Mensheviks, who had disappointed them in failing to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

press the issue of anti-Semitism. One of the Bund leaders, Liber, declared that the Fraction had not acted in defense of oppressed nationalities. He specifically meant the Jews: "We all consider the Duma as an agitational and organizational center and our Duma Fraction must be in contact with the population, it must struggle ideologically against all the cancers eating at the vitals of Russia, mercilessly exposing them; to come to the defense of the oppressed and underprivileged. Yet in relation to national oppression, I repeat, this was not done, although opportunities for this were many." (*Minutes of the Fifth Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party*, Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute, R. 285). Vinitsky-Medem carried the Bund criticism a step further. He indicated that disregard of anti-Semitism was not confined to the Duma Fraction alone: "Such an attitude towards the national question is an old sickness of the Party. A very weak struggle is being conducted against national oppression, against anti-Semitism . . . We called upon the Jewish poor to vote for the Social-Democrats as the most loyal and steadfast defenders of all oppressed. We pilloried our Jewish bourgeois 'dostizhentsi' for their 'diplomatic' intention to maintain silence on the Jewish Question in the First Duma. And now the Social Democratic Fraction already without any 'diplomacy' and contrary to all 'diplomacy' unintentionally repeats this very mistake." (286)

The Bundists confined their criticism within the framework of comradely relations with the Russian leadership and did not bring out that the line of the Fraction had been a perversion of the Plekhanov Resolution on the Jewish Pogroms unanimously adopted four years before at the Second Congress of the Party (July-August 1903). But they continued to give illustrations of chances the Fraction had ignored: "In the speeches on the budget it was not pointed out that special taxes were imposed on the Jews. No answer was given to Kokovtsev's mocking jests about 'imaginary national oppression.' "

Further criticism was levelled at the Fraction for the negligent attitude it had displayed in the interpellation on the most recent pogrom. Liber said: "Anti-Semites were given the opportunity to play a role of defenders of the Jews in the interpellation on the Sedlets pogrom." This criticism was echoed by the Menshevik leader, Plekhanov: "I must admit, I too regret that the inquiry into the Sedlets pogrom was made by the Narodovists, not by the Social Democrats." (315)

However, the Mensheviks, though their faction included many Jews, had a special fondness for the Fraction and defended its policy as best they could, while the Bolsheviks were not too critical. Delegate Danilov put the blame for the Fraction's violation of the obligations it had verbally undertaken to fight against the oppressors of Jews, first of all on the Bund: "I must say the same thing also to the comrades Bundists when they complain about the Fraction's insufficient attention to the national question. Comrade Vinitsky pointed

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to those occasions on which the Fraction could have raised the question of national oppression, as for instance during the discussion on the budget. However, the Fraction had a representative of the Bund; he should have pointed out, before all else, those opportune occasions, the special taxes imposed on Jews mentioned by Comrade Vinitsky, etc. The Bund representative failed to do this, and it is upon him, of course, before all others, that the blame lies." (294-5). Liber replied: "I will answer Comrade Danilov, who shifted the entire guilt in the matter of the national question upon Abramovich, who, in his opinion, was the instructor of the Fraction on the Jewish question. Comrade Danilov did the Fraction a disservice. If the fraction, which played such an outstanding role in the Duma, must be given directives every time, this only redoubles its guilt and does not speak in its favor. I think it is not the fault of the Fraction alone but of the entire Party. The Party has a superficial attitude towards the national question, and this is because the Russian Party has not freed itself from an academic approach to the national question. 'Proletariat of all countries unite!' this is our slogan; from it follows that we are against national oppression. And with this we may limit ourselves. Such is the dominant opinion in the Party. But on the national question the Fraction must always adopt its own distinct position. And yet at no time did it put forth its point of view to counterpose the viewpoint of other parties." (312)

Danilov's excuses had shifted responsibility also upon the Jewish workers. Liber took up this excuse: "Comrade Danilov says the Jewish workers are guilty of not having supplied information to the Fraction about their problems. But Comrade Danilov's words do not correspond to reality. More than ten statements were presented in the 'Peoples's Duma' itself. Our paper carried a whole series of articles. Yet neither Alexinsky, nor Tsereteli, nor Djaparidze with as much as one word mentioned the Jewish Question and protests of the Jewish workers against the Law of November 15. One should not occupy oneself with declamations but should in practice counterpose oneself to all other Parties." *(Ib.)*

The discussion on the Tsar's policy of anti-Semitism lasted for some days, and at length the Bund submitted a lukewarm resolution on the Report of the Fraction. The document absolved the Party leadership of blame and, instead of stating that the policy of the Fraction was a violation of revolutionary principles, merely said that the Fraction had failed to make use of its opportunities to explain the meaning of anti-Semitism to the masses:

"Resolution of the Bund Delegates on the national question. Having heard the report of the Duma Fraction and the debates connected with it, the Congress is compelled to record that the Duma Social Democratic Fraction did not utilize the Duma tribune to a sufficient degree for throwing light on the national question in Russia generally and on the Jewish Question in particular; that, under-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

evaluating the significance of this question as a concrete burning question of Russian reality, the Fraction did not take advantage of the situation to open the eyes of the wide masses of the population regarding the nationalist and anti-Semitic policy of the Russian Government and the close connection between the national oppression and the old order." (322)

The Bolsheviks, too, submitted a resolution on the Report of the Fraction. Their document was even more evasive than the Bund's:

"Resolution proposed by the Bolsheviks at the Congress. Having heard the report of the Duma Social Democratic Fraction, the Congress recognizes that the Fraction, having in general made an endeavor to be a worthy representative of the working class, not always, unfortunately, carried out with full consistency the viewpoint of the proletarian class struggle. This was manifested: 1) in the mistaken vote of the Social Democrats for a Cadet as the Chairman of the Duma, 2) in the non-Socialist and non-revolutionary motivation of the Declaration, 3) In dropping the Socialist basis on the budget resolution, 4) In adopting the bourgeois-Liberal slogan of subordinating the executive power to the State Duma, and in some other cases." (635, 636)

Thus the Bolsheviks completely left out any reference to the Tsar's anti-Jewish pogroms; even the word *Jews* was entirely omitted!

13. *Evidence of Conscious Evasion*

We must for a moment turn our attention away from the Congress and investigate the extent to which the Marxist leaders were politically conscious in evading the issue of anti-Semitism.

In 1903, a few weeks after the Kishinev pogrom, *Iskra,* edited by Lenin, Plekhanov and other foremost theoreticians of Russian Marxism, recalled that in 1881 this very pogrom tactic had been used to divert the discontent of the masses: "The Kishinev pogrom was organized by the local anti-Semites with the cordial participation of the police. The germs of anti-Semitism are assiduously cultivated in police stations. The Government, evidently, wants to repeat the tactic of 1881 when it stopped the revolutionary ferment that arose among the people by opening the safety valve of Jewish pogroms in the nick of time." *(Iskra,* #39, May 1, 1903). It will be noted that the Marxist theoreticians did not attempt to concoct an abstract reason for the collapse of the revolutionary situation in the Eighties but recognized that the pogroms served as a safety valve for the Tsar. *Iskra* could very well afford to give a correct explanation since the leaders of the masses in 1881 had been not Marxists but Populists, against whom Plekhanov and other founders of Russian Marxism had conducted a political struggle.

The knowledge among the Marxist leaders of the tremendous significance of the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy and, specifically, of his

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

pogrom tactic was deep and precise and they knew how lasting and damaging this 1881 policy had been: "It can be said without any exaggeration that the psychological consequences of the Jewish pogroms of 1881 have not ceased doing injury to our Socialist movement in the course of the entire past twenty years." *(Ib.)*. And Lenin, Plekhanov, Martov and other Marxists solemnly pledged to fight the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy, which they labelled the Tsar's *last card!* "In the early 80's Count Ignatiev succeeded in directing the rapidly rising discontent of the masses into the anti-Semitic channel and thereby to check for a long period the revolutionary movement in Russia. We, Social-Democrats, will reply to the impressive eloquence of anti-Semitic murders with the even more impressive eloquence of revolutionary action. With facts we'll convince the Government that times have changed and that it does not know the nature of the Russian workers in this period. Our Party, standing at the head of the proletariat, is obligated to prove that the Government is mistaken in its calculations to succeed in perverting the Russian working class by means of anti-Semitic hounding. The Party is obligated to summon counter-action to anti-Semitism from within the workers' own midst. It must organize its own forces to repel the 'pogromists.' How to do it exactly depends on each specific case, naturally, on local conditions . . . The Tsar's Government has flung its last card on the table. It devolves upon us to beat this card and with this act to cut off the Government's last road to safety. The Russian Social Democratic Labor Party will be strict in the fulfillment of its duty to the Russian working class, to the entire country." *(Ib.)*

And yet, despite the clear understanding of the purpose behind the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy, and in violation of the pledge to fulfill their duty to the proletariat, the Iskraists in *practice* shirked that duty. They were then reproached by the Bundists:

"It is a shame that up to now only *Svoboda* has come out with a pamphlet about the Jews, while *Iskra* which did not economize on paper to blacken the Bund, up to now has not found it possible to put out at least something on this subject." *(Poslednia Izvestia,* #126, Cited by Lenin, *Iskra,* #41, June 1, 1903. *Lenin on the Jewish Question,* R. 33)

Another indication that both the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks deliberately played down the issue of anti-Semitism was their refusal to permit a special Committee of the Kishinev Social Democratic organization to appear before the Second Congress of the Party (Brussels-London, July-August 1903). The Kishinev Committee had brought some specific information on the Kishinev pogrom, but Lenin, Plekhanov, Potresov, Martov, Trotsky and others were not interested. A Court of Arbitration, chosen at the Congress to settle various disputes among the factions, rejected the Kishinev Committee's request for admission: "The Court of Arbitration is of the opinion that the Committee of the Kishinev organization cannot furnish

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Congress with any new considerations on the question of the Party's attitude to the Jewish pogroms, which was the precise motivation given by the representatives of the Kishinev organization for participating in the Congress—the Court of Arbitration resolves: to refuse giving invitation to the Kishinev Committee to attend the Congress." *(Second Cong. R.S.D.L.P. "Resolution of the Court of Arbitration on the Question of Inviting, the Committee of the Kishinev Organization to the Congress."* R. 451)

Having minimized the importance of anti-Semitism by the refusal to hear the Kishinev Committee, the Russian Marxist leaders soon after the Congress were compelled to give lip service to the policy of struggle against anti-Semitism because of the Gomel pogrom: "It is a matter here of the very existence of Social Democracy. The victory of the anti-Semites would signify the end of Social Democracy as a party of the class-conscious proletariat." *(Iskra,* #50, Oct. 15, 1903; Plekhanov, "Police Anti-Semitism," XII, 468)

In September 1905, about four weeks before the Tsar issued his Manifesto, Lenin again described the pogrom tactic as the Tsar's "last card." The Government had been unable to stop the revolutionary tide by repressive measures and its last resort, Lenin stated, was to strike at the Jews:

"Two and a half years ago the Tsarist Government brought forth its 'last card' in the struggle against the Revolution. The dregs of the ruling classes united with the dregs of the people in the shameful butchering of the defenseless Jews of Kishinev . . . The usual means of repressions were powerless against the growing revolutionary movement of the proletariat. Despite all the exertions of the gendarmes, spies, police and troops, its organized strength and unity grew. So the Government, powerless to suppress this movement by means of executions, the knout and prisons, mobilized its loyal reactionary forces in order, by using them, to terrorize the revolutionary elements of the Jewry." *(Proletari,* Sept. 20, 1905. *C. W.* VI, R. 481). Lenin observed that the Tsar had been employing the pogrom tactic on a widening scale. "For the two and a half years which have elapsed since the Kishinev pogrom the Government has not invented other measures of struggle against the Revolution. Side by side with the old elementary crude method of suppressing it by armed force the Government has continued playing its one and the same last card. But with the growth of the revolutionary movement, with its unfolding throughout all of Russia there was the need to widen the field of operations of the reactionary forces, the need to give the struggle more and more grandiose dimensions. If the Kishinev pogrom appeared something of a fairy-tale monstrosity, some kind of a gory nightmare, than at this moment it has paled when compared with the new events, it has become a daily occurrence. 'Ans Ungeheure hast du mich gewoehnt' (you have accustomed me to the monstrous)—Russia can say to the Tsarist Government in Schiller's words. It has, indeed, 'accustomed'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

us to the monstrous events, we have become familiar with their appearance, we have gotten used to them, have ceased realizing all their horror. In the wake of the Kishinev pogroms came dozens of other Jewish pogroms." (482)

Prior to the terrible pogroms of October-November 1905 the Tsar's statesmen had been fairly outspoken about their intention to use the Jewish pogrom tactic against the Revolution. Von Pleve, Minister of Interior, who was assassinated by the SR Sazonov in July 1904, was particularly clear: "It was Von Pleve's aspiration 'to drown the Revolution in Jewish blood.' " (A. J. Sack, *The Birth of the Russian Democracy*, 77). The Black Hundreds' press in its violent denunciation of all the parties of the Left never ceased reminding them that in the event of a revolutionary upheaval the Tsar would take it out on the Jews: " 'Remember that every revolution in Russia in the final analysis will ride over Jewish corpses' *Kievlianin* kept reiterating as far back as 1905." (Shulgin, *What We Dislike in Them*, R. 153)

After the Tsar succeeded in downing the great 1905 proletarian-peasant upheaval, Lenin near the end of 1906, not many months before the Fifth Congress, very definitely indicated the persistence and prominence of the Tsar's pogrom tactic: "The 'replying' form of the autocracy's struggle has been the Black Hundreds' pogrom beginning with Kishinev in the Spring of 1903 and ending with Sedlets in the Autumn of 1906." (VII, Pt. II, R. 79)

Plekhanov, as we have seen, admitted in an article that between 1903 and the culminating stage of the pogrom tactic in 1905 no work of enlightenment on the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy had been carried out by the Party. But at the Fifth Congress Plekhanov did not raise the issue of the Party's failure to enlighten the masses, and Lenin did not spend even three and a half minutes to discuss *the* tactic which, he knew very well, the Tsar had been using against the Revolution for three and a half years.

14. *The Bund's Capitulation*

The consciousness of the importance of anti-Semitism grew among the Russian Marxists in the period from Kishinev to Sedlets, but at the same time, in practice, they all disregarded the problem. The Second Congress had at least adopted a paper resolution on the Jewish pogroms, but the Fifth Congress refrained from even such empty gestures. The question of the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy did not even receive enough consideration to be placed on the agenda but entered into the debates only insofar as it was related to the work of the Duma Fraction. The Mensheviks supported the record of the Fraction. The Bolsheviks, as we have seen, in their draft resolution on the Fraction omitted any mention of anti-Semitism and although they criticized other matters, stood essentially on the same ground as the Mensheviks. The Bund draft, though weak and uncritical of the Party's negligence,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

contained, however, a reference to the "Jewish question" and—considering the distinctly negative atmosphere of the majority at the Congress—a positive and extremely vital phrase: "the anti-Semitic policy of the Russian Government."

Because of the charge, often repeated by the Bund, that Russian Social Democracy had not given adequate attention to the interests of the Jewish workers, the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks had to eliminate the friction with the Bund on the issue of anti-Semitism. They realized that it would be tactically wise to record a "victory" for a Bund resolution. But at the same time their own line was for the exclusion of a direct and explicit statement on the anti-Semitic policy of the Tsar. They, therefore, brought pressure to bear on the Bund representatives to secure the deletion of the "objectionable" phrases in the Bund draft resolution. As a result the Bund representatives drew up a new document which hewed so closely to the line of the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks that they gave it support without even a formal discussion!

"The Chairman puts up for discussion the Draft of a resolution by the Bund Delegation on the national question in connection with the activity of the Duma Fraction:

" 'Considering that the Fraction, by its insufficient attention to the national question up to the last moment, missed the opportunity to utilize the Duma tribune to illuminate the national question in Russia and to establish contact with the wide masses of the oppressed nationalities, the Congress expresses a firm conviction that the Social Democratic Fraction will make every effort to rise to the proper heights in the realm of these questions as a representative of the interests of the whole working class in Russia.'

"The Resolution is voted without discussion and is *passed* unanimously with seventeen abstentions." *(Minutes of the Fifth Congress,* R. 604)

The Bund capitulated. This surrender proves the insincerity of Liber, Medem, and other Bund leaders. It shows that all their previous "criticisms" of the Fraction work and of the Party's neglect of the anti-Semitic Question were made so that they might save face before their own followers, the Jewish workers. The Bund leadership aided the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks to suppress a living political issue in the class struggle, an issue that had a direct bearing on the defeat of the 1905 Revolution.

15. *The Alexinsky-Stalin Monstrous "Joke'*

The Bundists were not the only Jews at the Fifth Congress. The Bolshevik faction had many Jews, while the Menshevik faction was predominantly Jewish. The latter circumstance was an indication, to the mind of the Bolsheviks, that they, not the Mensheviks, represented a *true* Russian tendency. One of them even cracked a "cheerful" jest

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

about the national composition of both factions. Stalin, who was a delegate to the Congress, included the joke in his article "The London Congress of the R.S.D.L.P.," published a few weeks after the Congress:

"Not less interesting is the composition of the Congress from the standpoint of nationalities. Statistics showed that the majority of the Menshevik faction consists of Jews—and this of course without counting the Bundists—after which come Georgians and then Russians. On the other hand, the overwhelming majority of the Bolshevik faction consists of Russians, after which come Jews—not counting of course the Poles and Letts—and then Georgians, etc. For this reason, one of the Bolsheviks observed in jest (it was, it seems, Comrade Alexinsky) that the Mensheviks are a Jewish faction, the Bolsheviks a genuine Russian faction, therefore it wouldn't be a bad idea for us Bolsheviks to arrange a pogrom in the Party." *(Bakinsky Proletari,* June 20, July 10, 1907; Stalin, II, R. 50-51)

This grim anti-Semitic "joke" was read by the workers while the terrified Jewish masses in Russia were still trembling in nightmarish expectation of new pogroms, when the memory of the thousands of mutilated bodies of Jewish men, women and children was vivid in the mind of the living. It is significant that neither Lenin, Plekhanov nor any other Marxist leader rejected or denounced this political "humor." Trotsky, who was present at the Fifth Congress, though siding with the Mensheviks did not criticize the Bolsheviks for their anti-Semitic humor and was silent about it for thirty-three years. It was only shortly before he was assassinated that he brought up the matter, attacking Stalin and Alexinsky personally *(Stalin,* 152) but passing lightly over the fact that the "joke" was published in a *Bolshevik* journal.

16. *The Position of the Jewish and World Bourgeoisie*

To have a comprehensive picture of the question under investigation it is necessary to ascertain the line adopted by the Jewish bourgeoisie and the world capitalist class as a whole toward the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy.

In Russia, as elsewhere, the Jewish bourgeoisie was the dominant political and economic force within the Jewish masses. It pursued a policy of verbally protesting the Government's anti-Semitic legislation and other oppressive measures against the Jews. One of its outstanding political figures, Vinaver, a St. Petersburg lawyer and a close collaborator of Milukov in founding the Cadet Party, laid down the following formula for the Jewish deputies in the Duma: " 'It is necessary to see to it that the Jewish question in the Duma proceeds as smoothly as possible and does not meet special friction and obstacles on its way. This tactical conduct must unite the Jewish Deputies. It expresses itself not only in speaking at the right time but also in being able to maintain silence at the right time.' " (Cited in *Minutes of the Fifth Cong. Rus. Soc. Dem. Labor Party,* R. 776)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Jewish bourgeoisie, of course, objected to pogroms, especially when they were directed in a larger measure against the Jewish capitalists as in Belostok. During the debate on the Belostok pogroms, a Duma member, Shchepkin, pointed out irrascibly that: "Neither the police nor the soldiers ventured into Surajskaya Street, the Peski or the Argentina quarter because there truly might be bombs; but the wealthier streets inhabited by the Jewish bourgeoisie, the same Jewry which fights the Bundists and Anarchists and which is hated by the Bundists and Anarchists as much as the police, were pogrom-ridden." (State Duma, First Conv., *Sten. Rep.* 1906, II, 1631). The strongest words of a Jewish bourgeois representative ever heard in the Duma were uttered by Levin who threatened to kill the pogromists if they attacked his wife and child even though the Tsar's Minister Pleve forbade self-defense. Otherwise the Jewish deputies carried out Vinaver's cringing formula.

Abroad the Jewish and Gentile bourgeoisie raised a verbal storm of protest against the pogroms. Bourgeois newspaper editors denounced the Nicholas II pogrom regime, and so did priests and rabbis. This policy of the capitalist class found expression even in official government institutions. Thus, in the United States on December 11, 1905 Congressman Sulzer of New York introduced a resolution in Congress:

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States, voicing the humanitarian sentiments of the American people, deplores the terrible crimes, the brutal outrages, and the uncalled-for and wanton murders of the Jews in Russia, and hereby condemns and denounces these awful outrages, these shocking assassinations, and these appalling atrocities as great international crimes against a common humanity that must be stopped, and stopped quickly, by the Russian Government; otherwise Russia, in the opinion of mankind, will and must stand indicted before the judgment bar of the world as beyond the pale of its civilization."

But by the time Congress got around to considering the question, the anti-Tsar protest of world bourgeois opinion had diminished. Instead of the Sulzer resolution another one was adopted by both Houses. All reference to the Russian Government as a responsible authority in the situation was omitted as was the threat to put Tsarist Russia beyond the pale of civilization. And the Tsar's use of the Jews as a scapegoat for political purposes was completely blotted out by the false assertion that the Jews were being massacred because of their "race" and religion. "Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled, That the people of the United States are horrified by the reports of the massacre of Hebrews in Russia, on account of their race and religion, and that those bereaved thereby have the hearty sympathy of the people of this country." (*American Jewish Year Book,* 1906-07, 91)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

There were some bourgeois "defenders" of the Russian Jews who were either stupid or dishonest to state that the victims of pogroms might have been at fault. At the Seventh International Jewish Missionary Conference of Amsterdam (April 25, 1906) a resolution brought in by Herman L. Strack and the Rev. Louis Meyer and passed *unanimously,* declared in part, "Though there may have been faults upon the Jewish side, no human or Divine right permitted Russian Government and police to incite the lower classes against the Jewish people . . ." (Cited in *Enc. of Religion and Ethics,* I, 596)

The insincerity of the bourgeois world was further emphasized by the concerted refusal of *all* powers to lodge official protest with the Tsar: "From the very beginning it was realized that no Power could be induced to offer formal protest to Russia, and thus possibly obviate a further recurrence of such atrocities. Still, attempts were made by Jews in different lands to induce their respective Governments to interfere. The replies received were uniformly courteous and sympathetic, but none found it possible, within the limits of international law and etiquette, to do anything decisive." *(Amer. Jewish Year Book,* 1906-7, 242-3)

The bourgeois governments were courteous and apologetic and at the same time the bankers behind these governments extended huge credits to the Tsar's pogrom government. Among these bankers were Jewish financiers: "Everybody knows that, for example, the chief supplier of *loans* to Russia is the Jewish banker Mendelsohn in Germany through whom the Russian Government has been negotiating loans in the last years. And prior to him billions of rubles were given the Government by many French banks in which Jews participate." (L. M-v, *The Russian People and the Jews,* R. 27). "It is startling to read in one and the same day's newspapers that the Rothschild Bleichroder combination had signed the contract for a new Russian loan, and that the Jews were to be expelled from Moscow. It is said that the decree of expulsion will affect 140,000 persons, and will break up 30,000 thriving homes." *(Jewish Chronicle,* May 1, 1891). The French Rothschilds for a while struck an anti-Tsarist pose and would not make loans to the pogromist rulers of Russia. However, the French bourgeoisie, to cement its military alliance with the Tsar and to strengthen his position, advanced him financial aid, and these Rothschilds, after all, were French patriots. "Of recent years the Rothschilds have consistently refused to have anything to do with loans to Russia, owing to the anti-Jewish legislation of that empire, though on one occasion the members of the Paris house joined in a loan to demonstrate their patriotism as Frenchmen." *(Jewish Enc.* X, 497)

Thus, directly or indirectly, the international bourgeoisie furnished aid to the Tsar and his Black Hundreds. The Marxists, as we have seen, did not fight against the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy although they admitted that to struggle against it was of vital importance to the Revolution. Each of these forces had its specific political reason. These

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

reasons can be grasped only by understanding what anti-Semitism is and what is its relation to the bourgeoisie and the Marxists.

CHAPTER II.

A MARXIST-IGNORED PHENOMENON IN THE ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL CLASS STRUGGLES— THE JEWISH SCAPEGOAT

1. *The Riddle of Anti-Semitism*

THE PHENOMENON of Anti-Semitism was present in society before the rise of the Tsardom of Muscovy, even before the advent of Christianity. No searching study of the question was undertaken by anyone in the thousand years of Feudalism and in the first centuries of Capitalism, and it has been only recently, in the historic sense, that the first groping attempts at such a study have been made.

The Marxists have hardly given any special attention to a real inquiry into anti-Semitism. The Bolsheviks, after severing organizational ties with the Second International, charged the men whom they had previously honored as "teachers" of the proletariat with evasion on this question: "The understanding of the Jewish Question by many theoreticians and leaders of the Second International has nothing in common with the revolutionary Marxist understanding of this question. First of all it is necessary to point out that they did not devote sufficient attention to this question and to the national question in general. But when the mass slaughter of Jews, pogroms or some other extraordinary manifestations of the Jewish question in capitalist society, forced them to come forth with an opinion, they treated the Jewish Question in the spirit of emancipatory Liberalism or Jewish nationalism, though covered up with Marxist phraseology." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXIV, 154)

With almost every new attempt to study the problem it was recognized that few questions attracted as much attention and failed to receive adequate explanation. The Stalin Member of the British Parliament, William Gallacher, acknowledged: "There is no subject on which there has been so much discussion and so little knowledge as that of anti-Semitism and the Jewish problem." (Introduction to *Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Question* by I. Rennap)

Pretentious as the Stalin burocracy has been, it has admitted, nevertheless, that the workers in the Bolshevik State did not understand the political nature of anti-Semitism: *"The political essence of anti-Semitism is hidden* from many workers, even from the class-conscious ones, even from the Communists." (L. Radischev, *Poison, On Anti-Semitism of Our Day,* R. 49. 1930). The grave significance of this situation within the proletarian vanguard becomes clear when one

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

recalls that it was precisely in the period when this admission was made that Hitler scored phenomenal gains in the September 14, 1930 elections on an anti-Semitic platform.

The Liberals, less pretentious than the Marxists, more readily admit their inability to probe the enigma of anti-Semitism to any appreciable depth. Some of them frankly concede defeat. A Liberal woman journalist states: "Anti-Semitism always rises in times of crisis . . . Who is to blame? That is the universal cry! And the easiest answer is: The Jews. Why particularly the Jews? I do not know the answer; I can only guess at it, on the basis of such reason and observation powers as I possess. Yet the answer evades reason because it is in a sphere where reason does not function." (Dorothy Thompson, *The Jews in the Family of Nations,* 3)

Other Liberal students have made earnest endeavors to arrive at an objective interpretation of the phenomenon. One such was Carey McWilliams whose study *A Mask for Privilege* was accorded widespread recognition. "I began this work by first seeking to find a workable definition of anti-Semitism. After examining dozens of definitions, I concluded that none of them was satisfactory or in any sense adequate. In fact I discovered, to my amazement, that the inadequacy of social theory in relation to this crucial problem is a scandal for which every social scientist in the United States should feel ashamed." (xiii)

Evidently determined to arrive at the solution of the mystery, McWilliams at the outset largely limited his scope to the American scene. He filled his book with numerous facts but failed to unravel the mystery and finally arrived at this bankrupt conclusion: "Anti-Semitism is a universal injustice." (270)

In no way adequate is the unintelligent capsule "class-struggle" diagnosis of anti-Semitism: "Anti-Semitism is a by-product of the class war. Here in a nutshell is the explanation of a social phenomenon which has been troubling the world for thousands of years." (G. Sacks, *The Intelligent Man's Guide to Jew-Baiting,* 126-7)

The Liberal writers on the subject clearly show their intellectual inability to discover the correct answer to the question *What is anti-Semitism?* One of the persistent searchers for this answer, E. Sheps, in his *Anti-Semitism—Why?,* reflects lugubriously "The question—why is the Jew hated?—is, therefore, as yet unanswered. Unfortunately it is not the only problem that plagues mankind." (12-13)

2. *What Is a Jew?*

Obviously a study of anti-Semitism involves an analysis of the people known as "Jews." To a bourgeois student the nature of this group is a puzzle in itself. "Any serious inquiry into the problem of anti-Semitism is faced at the outset by the puzzling question What is a Jew" (R. B. Dixon, *The Nation,* Feb. 21, 1923, 207). *What is a Jew?* is no more a mystery question than: What is a Frenchman, an Italian,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a Chinese, a Turk? The modern Italian, for example, is a thorough mixture of a multitude of European and Near Eastern strains, from the ancient Romans, Greeks, Arabs, Gauls, to the Teutons and Slavs. The English are a mixture of Britons, Gauls, Normans, Saxons and others. No group is racially "pure." This is acknowledged even among the open anti-Semites when they stop discussing the Jews for a moment. Thus, one of the professional Russian anti-Semites wrote: "The Russians of our epoch, that is, in the Twentieth Century, represent a colorful mixture of the most diverse peoples." (Shulgin, *What We Dislike in Them,* R. 109). The Russians have more Jewish blood in them than French or Indian, and they had Negro blood represented in the highest layers of society, for example, by their greatest national poet, Pushkin. Virtually all peoples of Europe have Negro admixture among them. "There is an ancient Negroid strain underlying the population of Southern and Western France, Italy, Sicily, Corsica, Sardinia, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Wales and Scotland." (H. Johnston, *Continental Review,* Aug. 1911, 159). This holds even more so for many parts of the Western Hemisphere. "The more peoples are civilized, the more they are intermixed within certain territorial limits." (Denicker, *Races of Man,* 3). What Shulgin admitted about the Russians he would never admit about the Russian Jews. The Jews in Russia were, to an extent, of non-Jewish origin: "It has been shown that a considerable part of the South Russian Jews are the descendants of the Chazars, a people of Turkish origin, who adopted the Jewish religion towards the end of the Seventh Century A.D." *(New International Encycl.* XII, 678)

The Jews are the most mixed group on earth due to their complete dispersedness which, for duration and scope, has no parallel in history. And it would be an error to think, as many people do, that the Ancient Jews, the Hebrews, were an unmingled consanguineous tribe. "The superficial reader of the Old Testament gains the impression that the Hebrews were of pure Semitic stock and were all descended from Abraham. . . . In reality a closer study of the Old Testament reveals the fact that many elements entered into the making of the Hebrew people, and the testimony of the Old Testament is confirmed by archaeology and technology." (G. A. Barton, *Semitic and Hemitic Origins,* 83). Ancient Palestine was full of non-Jewish slaves and bondsmen with whom Jews of all classes begot offsprings. The Ancient Jews adopted many racial outsiders. "The pagans embraced Judaism in great numbers, either completely or as 'proselytes of the gate,' as is attested both by the Jewish apologist Josephus and the hostile Seneca in words which have often been quoted. This shows not merely that the hatred of Jews had by no means become general among all pagan nations, but also that intercourse between Jews and non-Jews must have been far more intimate than we are led to conclude from antisemitic complaints of the Jews' exclusiveness." (H. Valentin, *Antisemitism,* 25)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In the Roman Empire the peoples intimately intermingled with the Jews, and during the age of Feudalism and the early phase of Capitalism most nations and races, Greeks, Italians, Moors, Turks, Spaniards, Germans, French, British, Poles, Russians, Rumanians,—Alpine, Nordic, Negroes, Mongolians—virtually all—contributed to the ethnical makeup of the group called "Jews." Thus, the Jews are derived from virtually *all* nations and races, and, conversely, through baptism and other channels the Jews have contributed vast numbers of "non-Jews" to the populations of various countries. However, the intermarriages of the Gentile and Jew were in most places unofficial, even illegal. A child born to a man or woman of Jewish lineage was a Jew, just as the children of a White and a Negro are popularly considered to be Negroes. Among the Jews themselves it is readily granted that the Jews cannot be classified as a homogeneous body in a physical, ethnical or even in a religious sense. A rabbi writes: "It is evident that under present conditions Jews are not a nation in the political sense, nor a race in the scientific sense, nor a religious sect in the denominational sense . . . the Jewish people, by virtue of its peculiar history, is unlike any other people and cannot be satisfactorily measured and defined by the conventional yardsticks." (Israel Goldstein, *Toward a Solution)*

That in some Jews this or that admixture is emphasized more than in other Jews is a fact, but to say that one is a *typical* Jew is to stretch imagination beyond scientific reality. Many individuals have pronounced physical characteristics of nationalities to which ethnologically they are regarded as totally alien: "Clemenceau was more Chinese in appearance than T. V. Soong. Wellington Koo, the important Chinese diplomat, has features which might pass as Jewish. Justice Brandeis, with a beard, would resemble Abraham Lincoln." (G. Sokolsky, *We Jews,* 34). "Dr. Fishberg, in his recently published monograph, *The Jews,* demonstrates how innumerable 'permanent' Jewish characteristics dissolve into thin air with change of social conditions." (G. Spiller, *Science and Race Prejudice,* 9)

Since the "Jews" are not an ethnical unit, what has kept them from fully assimilating with other peoples among whom they have dwelt for thousands of years? Why and at what point in their history did the "Jews" become a universal social-political scapegoat?

3. *The Diaspora and the Springboard for the Defamation of the Jews*

The Jews of antiquity gradually became dispersed in many lands. Among chief causes of the dispersion were internal wars and the conquests by the Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks and eventually by the Romans. The Babylonians carried off a large part of the Jewish population. After the final destruction of the Jewish Kingdom by the Romans in 70 C.E. Palestine became a mere province of the Roman Empire which embraced most of the then known world. The Jewish dispersal throughout the Empire became commonplace.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A large proportion of Jews continued the agricultural pursuits of their forefathers; many had turned to commerce during the pre-Roman conquest and had founded colonies in Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, Messopotamia and other lands. To these Jews their Hebrew language served as a convenient medium for intercourse, and their religion as an ideal means for select wealthy Jews and priests to hold the Jewish community together and to dominate it. The interests of these privileged elements necessitated a policy of resistance to assimilation.

Because their religion differed from all others and due to their practice of non-assimilation, the Jews were consistently regarded as strangers in the lands of Diaspora from the moment they arrived.

Suspicion, dislike and fear of strangers—xenophobia—is a common phenomenon in primitive society and in backward civilization. Unscrupulous people in all ages have made use of xenophobia for their own purposes. They have turned the dislike of strangers into organized hatred and have supplanted vague suspicion with some invented accusation. In this manner innocent strangers would be transformed into scapegoats to divert the attention of the native population from some political issue or some crime committed by the very accusers. Of all the religious-social groups that have existed throughout history none has been so ideally suited for the role of a scapegoat as the Jews.

4. *The First Stages of the Defamation of the Jews and the Early Roman Persecution*

The designation of a man as a scapegoat involves blackening his reputation. Once this is accomplished any crime can creditably be imputed to him. Although there is a popular misconception that anti-Semitism originated with the Jewish rejection of Christianity, the defamation of the Jewish Scapegoat actually began some centuries before the Christian Era. The birthplace of the false accusations against the Jews which in their aggregate are known as anti-Semitism is considered to be Alexandria, Egypt. (Amfiteatrov, *The Origin of Anti-Semitism,* II, R. 4). Specialists arose who applied skill and inventiveness to this task. "The earliest 'Anti-Semitic' author was the Egyptian priest Manetho (B. C. 270-250)" *(Enc. of Religion and Ethics,* I, 594). Outstanding writers, philosophers, historians and statesmen joined in levelling the most diverse accusations against the Jews: Plutarch (46?) in his *Questiones convi vales* (IV, 5) said that the Jews worshipped an ass and would not eat rabbits because of resemblance to an ass. Apion was the originator of this assinine worship story. (H. Valentin, 22). "Tacitus, the model for historians, repeats the fables of Manetho as to the origin of the Jews and adds that their laws are 'hostile to men and calculated to inspire the Jew with hatred and opposition to the rest of mankind.' " *(Enc. Americana,* XVI, 98). The great Roman orator, Cicero, either in ignorance or in conscious malice, declared: "The Jews belong to a dark and repulsive force." Seneca, a Roman poet,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

wrote: "The vices of this most infamous of all peoples have already become so strong that they have spread to all lands; the vanquished have forced their laws upon the victors."

Seneca's mildest expression about the Jews was "this abominable nation." *(Enc. Americana,* XVI, 99). Aristotle viewed the Jews as "beasts and plants" and advised Alexander to treat them accordingly.

The defamation did not consist of false accusations and slander alone. Humorous anti-Semitism was added to arouse contempt for the Jewish Scapegoat. In the confused eyes of the present-day Jewish Liberals it was not anti-Semitism but merely "amusement" of the masters of Roman society: "It is true that such Roman poets as Horace, Martial and Persius, and such a satirist as Petronius directed their jibes against the Jews, and that the mimes in the theatres ridiculed them, but this wit was not so much malicious as intended to amuse." *(Universal Jewish Enc.* I, 350)

The decisive turn in the development of the Jewish group as a classical scapegoat came with Christianity. Many Fathers of the Church were outspokenly anti-Semitic. Tertullian (b. 160) wrote: "Indeed the Jews are responsible for the shameful condition to which we have been led at the present." *(Ad. Marcionem,* III, 23). Addressing the Jews direct Tertullian exclaimed: " 'O, evil men, in so many places, and so often rebuked by the law of those who cry aloud.' Origen, who was one of the greatest of the Fathers, wrote in a similar strain, and Athanasius, whose creed became that of Catholic Christendom, called them outcasts, and further said of them: 'They are no longer called a people of God and a holy nation, but rulers of Sodom and people of Gomorah; having exceeded in this even the iniquity of the Sodomite, as the prophet also saith, Sodom is justified before thee.' . . . Jerome, whose activity dates to from the last half of the fourth century, and who was, as we have seen, a contemporary and correspondent of Augustine, was just as relentless as his predecessors. Augustine was . . . permeated with anti-Jewish prejudice which had come to be a tradition in the Church." (E. Lederer, "The Early Christian Fathers and Their Attitude Towards the Jews." *Jewish Exponent,* March 24, 1899)

As Christianity gained ground and many influential Romans accepted it, the persecution of the Christians proportionally lessened, and the Jews by degrees evolved as the primary scapegoat. The first legislation to mark the Jews off from the rest of the Roman population was introduced in the Fourth Century by Constantine with his adoption of Christianity as a State religion. *(Enc. Judaica,* II, 975). In his edict of 315 Constantine referred to the Jews as "that disgraceful sect."

In sum, the Defamation of the Jewish Scapegoat, originating in the pre-Christian Era, became rooted in the Christian society. During the thousand years of Feudalism the Defamation was augmented with many new invented accusations against the Scapegoat. "In fact, it was during this period that those notions of the Jew were cultivated which,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

handed down by tradition, underlie much of the prejudice which is the basis of the anti-Semitism of today." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* I, 350-1)

5. *Some Basic Parts of the Defamation Before the Bourgeois Era*

One of the most vicious calumnies against the Jews has been the Blood Accusation, otherwise known as the Ritual Murder Charge. The origin of the fictitious tale that the Jews killed non-Jews for ritual purposes also dates to the pre-Christian Era. "Apion tells us that the Jews had a secret law commanding them annually to fatten and slaughter a Greek, to eat his entrails, and in so doing to pledge themselves by oath to hate the Greeks. It was thus the lie of ritual murder, so often exploited since, which was originated by this author." (Valentin, 23)

A later "explanation" was that the victim's blood was drunk by the Jewish males who allegedly had lost blood through menstruation. A writer remarks sarcastically: "Do you know why the Jews require blood? You think it is for the matzos? No, this explanation came later. The Jews, you see, needed blood against menstruation from which, as it was positively known to the anti-Semites of the Twelfth Century, male Jews suffered, as well as 'against other revolting diseases widespread among these people.'" (Usov, *Legend and Facts,* R. 25)

Although the Blood Accusation became a distinctly anti-Jewish libel, it was often used against the early Christians and others. The accusers would often extort confessions of ritual murder from Jews and the early Christians. "In Justin Martyr, Atengora and especially in Tertullian (in his *Apologeticum)* we find eloquent pages full of indignation against the despicable accusation of utilization of blood for religious purposes levelled by the Pagans against the Christians. Tertullian exclaims: 'Either prove it if you believe it or stop believing if you cannot prove it!' Justin Martyr says: 'You rely on the confessions made at the trial by several members of our society, but can one consider these confessions which were torn by means of torture from our wives, children and slaves as court evidence?'" (Usov, 26)

The ruling elements used the Blood Accusation primarily for political and economic purposes. Thus, "Under Marcelus II the Jews were expelled from Rome in consequence of accusation of the murder of children." *(New Schaff-Herzog Enc. of Religious Knowledge,* VI, 59). The Spanish Inquisition was launched by resorting to the Blood Accusation: "It may be said that the earlier history of the Spanish Inquisition culminated in the expulsion of the Jews... following upon the supposed ritual murder of a child afterwards venerated as El Santo Nino de la Guardia. It is noteworthy that even so severe a critic of the Holy Office as R. Sabatini *(Torquemada,* pp. 271-355) finds it impossible, after an elaborate study of the documents of the process, to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

arrive at any satisfactory explanation of this mysterious murder." (*Enc. of Religion and Ethics,* IX, 451)

The Blood Accusation was employed as a means of extorting money or cancelling debts to Jews: "In Hungary, in 1529, Count Wolf of Bazin had thirty Jews burned alive after they had confessed the ritual murder of a Christian boy. Later the lad was found living in Vienna; the Jews, it was discovered, had been creditors of the count." (*Univ. Jewish Enc.* II, 408)

Between the Twelfth and the Seventeenth Centuries the Defamers were industrious in putting out literature portraying Jews as ritual murderers. "The legend of the ritual murder of Christian children inevitably found its way on to the stage." (Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages,* 279). An example: in the *Jew of Malta* (end of Act III), which was staged in 1592, Marlow gave credence to the Blood Accusation.

How deep the Defamation penetrated the consciousness of the masses can be seen from the following, occurring in Poland in the Sixteenth Century: "The belief that Jews used Christian blood in the Matzah (unleavened bread) was so widespread among the population that on several occasions peasants in want brought their children to the rabbi of Brest and offered to sell them to the Jewish community to be slaughtered for Passover." (Gershom Bader, *Jewish Forum,* May 1947, 133)

A basic part of the Defamation of purely Christian origin was built around the legendary figure of Jesus—"The Jews Killed Our Lord." This accusation was largely used during the Crusades to instigate pogroms. The cruel irony of the situation was that the Jews were forced to pay for equipping many of their own murderers: "Jewish merchants and usurers helped to finance the Crusades, but this did not prevent the fanatical crusaders, whipped up by their priests, from sacking whole Jewish communities on the way to the Holy Land." (I. Rennap, 20)

The inflamed religious and anti-Jewish atmosphere was utilized by King Edward to rob the Jews of virtually all their possessions and expel them from his domain in France and from England: "In his need, not to say greed, of money, Edward next turned his eyes on the unfortunate Jews. It is not impossible that they may not have been very ready to pay crusading taxes. At any rate, 'as enemies of the Cross' our King in 1288 expelled them from Gascony and all his other territories in France. In the following year he expelled them from England, needless to say confiscating their property, but allowing them their expenses to France. We are told that the wretched exiles encountered a severe storm on their departure from our shores, and that, in consequence, many of them were drowned." (Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages,* XVII, 221)

During the Crusades the Jews were blackened as the greatest criminals in society. This led St. Thomas Aquinas (1227-1274) to con-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

clude: "they are already so hopelessly damned that no crime could aggravate their condition." (Cited by U. Z. Engelman, in the *Rise of the Jew in the Western World,* 32)

While the basic features of the Defamation existed throughout the ages, specific accusations against the Scapegoat were concocted to serve in immediate contingencies. The Christian rulers often employed Jews as statesmen, physicians and in other professional capacities. But this too was fraught with danger to the Jews. For example: "Hugh Capet's death in 996 was charged against the Jews because Hugh's physician was a Jew." *(New Schaff-Herzog Enc. of Rel. Knowledge,* VI, 59). "During the pontificate of Sergius IV Western Europe was profoundly moved by the news that, in accordance with the orders of the demoniacal Fatimite Caliph of Egypt, El Hakim (996-1021), the church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem had been levelled to the ground (1010). According to Raoul Glaber, who has always something wonderful to tell us, the Caliph was moved to this action by the Jews . . . The consequent destruction of the basilica, and the spreading of the news that it had been caused by the Jews, brought about a general persecution of them, and an episcopal mandate prohibiting Christians from having any kind of dealings with them." (Mann, V, 144)

In the age of the Crusades, in addition to the massacres for "murdering our Savior," the Jews were executed on various minor charges. "In 1278 the circulation of counterfeit coin was attributed to the Jews and 293 were hanged." *(New Schaff-Herzog,* etc. VI, 59)

It is impossible to list all the invented crimes the Jews were accused of throughout centuries. "The Jews were regarded as dangerous magicians and seducers, superstitious rumors ascribing all possible crimes to them. The ambassador of the Muscovite Grand Duke, Basil III, at Rome, observed in 1526 to the Italian scholar Paolo Giovio: 'The Muscovite people dread no one more than the Jews.'" (S. M. Dubnov, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland,* I, 242)

No less devastating to the Jews was the accusation of a leper-conspiracy and the charges of spreading the plague during the Black Death which ravaged Europe from 1348 to 1369. The leper story was used to expell the Jews from France, again with the purpose of robbing them: "For some reason, the suspicion became current, in 1321, that the lepers were planning to spread their disease. The population in the towns and villages of Southern France were terrified. Some lepers were put to torture. A 'confession' was thus forced out of them to the effect that the Jews and the Mohammedans of Spain, in league to poison the Christian population of Europe, had bribed the lepers to spread disease by poisoning the wells from which people drew their water. The stupidity of this accusation should have been evident from the fact that the Jews drank the same water. Nevertheless, hundreds of Jews were tortured and killed. It was well understood by the more intelligent people that plunder, not self-protection, was the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cause for these crimes. An enormous sum of money was extorted from others by the King. Then, completely ruined economically, they were once more expelled from the entire country." (S. Grayzel, *A History of the Jews,* 389)

Equally terrible for the Jews was the charge that they were spreading the Black Death: ". . . the horrors of the time were further heightened by the fearful persecution to which the Jews were subjected, from a popular belief that the pestilence was owing to their poisoning the public wells. The people rose to exterminate the Hebrew race . . . They were killed by fire and by torture wherever they could be found, and for them to the terrors of the plague were added those of a populace everywhere infuriated against them. In some places the Jewish people immolated themselves in masses; in others, not a soul of them survived the assaults of their enemies." *(Enc. Amer.* IV, 33). The fury of the ignorant mobs was directed by government officials: "Early in the Summer of 1348 the Swiss were burning the Jews as actual or potential well-poisoners. By autumn the burnings spread to South Germany and the Rhinelands, and by winter into central Germany and eastward. In many cases the plague did not arrive until a year after the pyres had grown cold. Unlike earlier persecutions, the burnings and massacres were carried out, as sanitary and financial measures, under the auspices of the local authorities." (M. Lowenthal, *The Jews of Germany,* 125-6). "In Strasburg, the Rue Brulee remains as a monument to the two thousand Jews burned there for poisoning the wells and causing the plague of 1348." (A. D. White, Cited by J. Baron in *Stars and Sand,* 199). Persecution and extermination of Jews as a Scapegoat at the time of the Black Death "were not stemmed at the frontier, an ancient chronicler recording that the Jews were exterminated at this period in almost the whole of Poland." (Roth, *A Short History of the Jewish People,* 288)

After the Black Death a whole series of mass uprisings occurred in various countries of Europe. The Defamation was used to divert the masses' attention to the Jewish Scapegoat. "The prosperity which followed the Black Death was enjoyed by the noblemen, city patrician, merchant, and guildsman, at the expense of the backward and defenseless masses. Peasant uprisings and city rebellions—heralded a century before—became continental in scope. John Ball 'the mad priest' and Wat Tyler in England, Jacques Bonhomme in France, the communists at the heels of John Huss in Bohemia, and a little later John of Leyden and his Anabaptists in Germany were one man: the forgotten man reminding the world that he was forgotten. Parallel with these unsuccessful revolutions and fed by the same grievances were the reillumined pyres and massacres of the Jews." (Lowenthal, 134)

A conspicuous part of the Defamation was the accusation of arson levelled against the Scapegoat in the centuries when great fires were a common occurrence. "The Jews of the Diaspora lived for whole centuries under the heavy weight of this suspicion. They were accused

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of all the great fires in the cities which naturally evoked savage massacres by the mob often backed by the political bourgeoisie as well as by the government." (Amfiteatrov, I, 60)

A very common Christian part of the Defamation in the Middle Ages was the charge of the desecration of the host. Out of a mass of material at hand we shall cite a few illustrations. In 1290 in France a story was circulated that a Jew, Jonathas, allegedly made a deal with a Gentile woman that he would cancel a debt she owed him if she procured a host from the communion services. She supposedly carried out the alleged agreement. Jonathas, the story continued, plunged a knife into the wafer which spurted blood, then he threw the host into boiling water but the host continued to bleed. When the tale became widespread the authorities seized Jonathas and put him on the rack and after horrible tortures he "confessed." He was burned alive and on the spot of his execution was erected a church situated at 24 Rue des Archives in Paris. A rusty knife alleged to have been used by Jonathas was preserved for centuries and was still there in 1812.

Many cases of "desecration of the host" occurred in Germany. "The massacre of the Jews in Deggendorf in 1337, which was followed by tragic consequences in Bavaria, Bohemia, Moravia and Austria, was likewise caused by the accusation that the Jews had acted irreverently toward the host." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* V, 471). "In Berlin, 38 Jews were burned alive on July 19, 1510, because they were charged with having stolen a host from the church of the village Knaublanch, piercing it with knives until blood came out in abundance, and then sending it to Brunswick where it was desecrated. The property of the executed was confiscated." (M. Huntenberg, *Jesus, the Crucified Jew,* 135)

The "host desecration" by Jews served as a subject for the works of some of the greatest writers of the period: "Such were the 'Prioress's Tale' in the *Cantenbury Tales* of Chaucer, and the play that was performed in commemoration of the alleged host desecration at Deggendorf, in Bavaria. Of course, the Jews were throughout portrayed as monsters thirsting for Christian blood and secretly plotting to overthrow Christian religion." *(Univ. J. Enc.* III, 175)

6. *Who Created the Jew-Usurer*

Once the Defamation and the Jewish Scapegoat became an established institution of Feudalism, the Church and the nobility adopted an extreme policy of social and economic degradation of the Jews. In the midst of the Crusades "as a result of this religious fervor, repressive laws were enacted which excluded the Jew from owning or cultivating land, against the strenuous opposition of Jewish farmers and Jewish religious authorities. The immediate causes for these laws were that as the Jews were unbelievers, they could not take the oath of fealty to the feudal lord. The Jews were by law excluded from military

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and civil service. The Jews were thus forced into the one remaining occupation which was forbidden by the Church to the Christians, namely, the loaning of money on interest. Christians, under the Church law, were allowed to take usury from heathens, or Jews. There were, however, during this time certain people, bankers as well as nobility, engaged in money-lending on a larger scale. According to the famous historian, Lamprecht, up to the 12th century the chief loans were made by the clergy; up to the 13th century by citizens and nobles, and only in the 14th century by Jews. The Jews were engaged in petty money-lending, and this made them a plausible scapegoat to the easily inflamed masses. In order to escape the Church's opprobrium, many wealthy Christians used the Jews as money-lenders, and then seized the profits which accrued.

"Barons, dukes, and rulers made the Jew the tax collector. They were assigned to the duty of wresting from the peasants the highest possible return for taxes. Money-lenders and tax collectors are not friendly visitors, and become the object of the hate of the victims.

"The Jews were regarded as the personal property of the ruler, king, duke, and were, of course, denied citizenship and restricted to living in certain quarters which were named 'the ghetto.'

"As a consequence, these repressive laws, in turn, gave cause for new accusations against the Jew. The effects from these repressive laws were then used to create the motif for hate when general enlightenment would no longer tolerate religious persecution, and the doctrine of freedom of thought and religious belief became prevalent, then the charge against the Jew was that he had been a money-lender and a usurer; that he was not in proper proportion engaged in farming and tilling the soil; that he was not in proper proportion engaged in handicraft; that he was clannish, and that he was principally the middleman and merchandiser.

"It must be evident that if he had not for centuries lived in the ghetto, he would not be prone to be clannish. If he had not been denied the right to own and cultivate land, he would more likely today have followed his original vocation of farming and tilling the soil. If he had not been excluded from guilds, he would have engaged largely in handicraft." (Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, *Questions and Answers Concerning the Jew,* Question A, Appendix, XII-XIV)

That usury as a profession was *forced* upon the Jews by the masters of Feudal society is clearly seen from all available sources. Hardly any means of earning a livelihood was left open to the Jews. In 1442, in addition to being forbidden to engage in agriculture and handicraft—"Jews cannot be merchants, tax collectors or agents in the buying and selling of the produce and goods of Christians, nor their procurators, computers or lawyers in matrimonial matters, nor obstetricians." *(Bull Rom. Pont. V,* 67, Decree of Eugenius IV). Pope Paul IV on July 14, 1555 decreed: "Jews can only engage themselves in the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

work of street-sweepers and rag-pickers, and cannot be produce-merchants or in things necessary for human use." *(Bull, Rom. Pont.* V, 67; Cited in Hadassah, *Jewish Survival in the World Today,* III-A, 8). Clement VIII on February 28, 1592 forbade the Jews to trade in new merchandise. Benedict XIII repeated this prohibition on March 21, 1729.

Thus, for centuries there were virtually only two legal occupations left open to the Jews—money-lending, when they had money, and scavenging for and selling old clothes and used household goods. ". . . it was the policy of the Church that drove the Jews into money-lending as a characteristic trade." *(Enc. Brit. "Jews"* XV, 405). And when the Jews were banished they were robbed of everything they possessed and their persecutors seized also the fruits of usury: "Philipp IV the Handsome not only profited by the sale of the property of the exiled Jews (1306) but no worse than any usurer collected and pocketed the debts owed to the Jews." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.,* XXIV, 26)

The squeezing of the Jews for money took different forms in different periods and countries. "Under Philipp Augustus (1180) the condition of the Jews underwent a turn for the worse. He was not a religious fanatic, but, in need of money, he compelled the Jews to pay their tributes when not due and for that purpose sometimes ordered all the Jews of a given province arrested and kept in prison until they paid a definite sum." *(Novy Enc. Slovar,* XVII, 205). "The extortions to which the Jews were subject in the thirteenth century, and the periods both before and after, exposed them to the most tyrannical and cruel mutilations, if they refused to pay the sums demanded of them. 'King John,' says Hume, 'once demanded 10,000 marks from a Jew of Bristol, and on his refusal, ordered one of his teeth to be drawn every day, till he should consent. The Jew lost seven teeth and then paid the sum required of him.' Chap. XII, A. D. 1272." (Nares, *Glossary of Words,* 449)

Another form was multiple taxation of the Jewish traders: "It may safely be said that the Jewish trader in the later middle ages was bound hand and foot. In England money-lending was absolutely the only profession open to the Jew. On the continent, the Jews were taxed when they entered a market and taxed when they left it; they were only permitted to enter the market-places at inconvenient hours, and the Church ended by leaving the Jews nothing to trade in but money and second-hand goods." (Abrahams, 261)

Attacks upon usury so stigmatized it that the *basic* means of exploitation under Feudalism—land tenure and serfdom and slavery on Church lands—by comparison appeared as decent relationships, and the damnation of the Jews set off the clergy and landed aristocracy as noble elements of society. And by making the Jews take the blame for usury, the kings and the bishops, in full control of the Jews' life and property, took from the Scapegoat the lion's share of the proceeds of usury. "The Jews were unwilling 'sponges' by means of which a large

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

part of the subjects' wealth found its way into the royal exchequer. The kings and princes of Europe were the arch-usurers of the middle ages. Their example was not lost on the lesser nobility, among which must be included some leading clerics, who entrusted sums of money to the Jews whom they protected, in order that the latter might earn profit for their lords. Nowhere was this system more clearly exhibited than in England." (263-4)

The "protection" method of wringing payments from the Jewish Scapegoat was practiced for centuries. In the period of the Crusades the Jews endured in addition to all the other tortures, cruel punishment for the defeats suffered by the Crusaders, and the rulers used these situations for extorting "protection" money from the vitcims: "Toward the autumn of 1182 the news of the fall of Jerusalem to the power of Saladin began to spread in Europe. The Israelites were once more exposed to danger, and were only protected by money given to the Emperor." (L. Zunz, *The Suffering of the Jews during the Middle Ages,* 42-3)

The Inquisition on the one hand carried out the orders of the Church and forced the Jews to live by usury but on the other hand persecuted them for this practice: ". . . those who practiced usury were 'suspected of not holding very orthodox doctrine as to theft' (Vacandard), and on this account the Inquisition gained a hold on them. Pope Martin V (6th November 1419) authorized inquisitors to take proceedings against usurers." *(Enc. Brit.* "Inquisition," XIV, 591)

In France the "protection" racket was eventually exercised by the State, "paying to Louis XIV a protection tax as Jews." *(Jewish Quarterly Review,* "The French Revolution and the Emancipation of the Jews," XIX, 1907, 543)

To systematize and legalize the extortion the English lords created a special department for the purpose of pumping money from the masses through the Jews: "The Jews were regarded as the King's serfs, and squeezing them was but a popular form of taxing the people." *(Enc. Brit.* "Money-Lending," XVIII, 708). "At the end of the 12th century was established the 'exchequer of the Jews,' which chiefly dealt with suits concerning money-lending, and arranged a 'continual flow of money from the Jews to the royal treasury.' " (XV, 409)

It is obvious that both the Jews and the Christian masses were victims of the aristocratic and Church bloodsuckers. Yet the curse was usually placed on the Jewish Scapegoat. As an example, on June 10, 1612 the bourghers of Frankfurt in a petition referred to the Jews as "vultures" who "do not desist until they have consumed the marrow in the bones and reduced the citizen to beggary."

7. *Anti-Semitic Entertainment and Ridicule*

During the dark and brutal centuries of Feudalism, "humorous" anti-Semitism provided a means of relief, recreation and amusement

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

for the dignitaries of the Church and the ruling elements of the State. "The Jew had been the object of an outrage and insult which has continued till our own times. In parts of Persia, whenever a provincial governor holds high festival, the *pieces de resistance* are 'fireworks and Jews.' The latter are cast into muddy tanks, and their efforts to extricate themselves are the chief element of the fun." (Abrahams, 278). A form of sport and torture combined was the custom of Jew-slapping. "At Toulouse, France, on every Good Friday, the Christian mayor gave the president of the Jewish community a slap on the face, his example being followed by his fellow-Christians. On Easter Sunday, 1312, the Viscount de Rochechuard, High Chappellain d'Aymaric, came to attend the splendid festival in Toulouse. The nobleman was chosen to perform the immemorial function of slapping the Jew. Sir Hugh was as strong of hand as he was zealous of faith, and the slap he administered was of such vigor that he dashed out the brains of the Jew." (M. Hunterberg, *Jesus, the Crucified Jew,* 132). This humiliation and torture was eventually discontinued—for a price: "In Toulouse it was the right of the Count on Good Friday to administer to the chief of the Jewish community a box on the ear. The Jews secured immunity from this by paying a yearly tribute, and in the same way elsewhere they purchased the good will of the powerful." *(New Schaff-Herzog Enc.* etc. VI, 59)

Ridicule was heaped on the dead Jews and on the Jews murdered legally by the State. Some of the forms of mockery were particularly horrible as the "Jewish Execution" or "Judenstrafe" practiced for several centuries in medieval Germany: "In its standard form, it consisted in hanging the Jewish offender by the feet, instead of the neck, and in similarly stringing up two dogs beside him. . . . The gruesome practice is attested from late thirteenth to early seventeenth century. . . . This standard form of the 'Jewish execution' appears to have been common in most of the leading cities of Germany. . . . A significant variation from this standard form, similarly combining ridicule with torture, is reported in fourteenth and fifteenth century records from Brun and Nurnberg. There the Jewish offender, hanged *by the neck,* in the normal way, was made to wear a 'Jews' hat' filled with boiling pitch, which coursed over his body." *(Jewish Social Studies,* Jan. 1943, 3, 5, 7)

8. *The Social Outlawing of the Jewish Scapegoat*

Simultaneously with the economic repression, laws were introduced officially isolating the Jews as social outcasts. Since physically they were no different than other people they were "ordered to wear a distinctive dress, lest Christians should be deceivd into marrying them." (Mann, XII, 298). Pope Honorius III in the Bull of April 29, 1221 prescribed for the Jews a distinctive badge. Martin V in the Bull of June 3, 1425 repeated the badge order. Pope Eugenius IV in 1442

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

issued very stringent rules of Jewish segregation: "We decree and order from now on, and for all time, Christians shall not eat or drink with Jews, nor admit them to feasts, nor cohabit with them, nor bathe with them. . . . Against them Christians may testify, but the testimony of Jews against Christians in no case is of any worth. All and every Jew, of whatever sex and age, must everywhere wear the distinct dress and known marks by which they can be easily distinguished from Christians. They may not live among Christians, but must reside in a certain street, outside of which they may not, under any pretext have houses . . ." *(Bull. Rom. Pont.* V, 67)

The hounded Jewish group itself was blamed for the condition imposed upon it by the Church and the aristocracy: "The Jews, who are admitted to our acquaintance only through our mercy, should never forget their yoke of perpetual slavery, which they bear through their own fault." (Gregory IX, *Bull. Rom. Pont.* III, 497; Cited in Hadassah, *Jewish Survival in the World Today,* III,-A, 7)

The Jews were used as a means of dishonoring one's enemies. For illustration, when Bogdan Khmelnitsky "led" the Ukrainian revolt against the Polish domination, "Every Uniate or Catholic priest who could be caught was hung up before his own high altar, along with a Jew and a hog." *(Enc. Brit.* XXI, "Poland," 915)

9. *Mohammedan Defamation of the Jewish Scapegoat*

The Islamic world contributed a large share in building up the Defamation and in hounding the Jewish Scapegoat. Mohamet himself (567 C.E.?), among whose early followers were some Jews, declared: "Would one not immediately kill wild beasts who devoured men, even if they had human form? Are these Jews anything else but devourers of men?" Mahomet levelled invented accusations against the Jews and on this basis conducted a policy of extermination:

"They are further charged with exercising their magical arts on the Prophet and his followers, and to have succeeded thereby in producing barrenness among the Moslem women. . . . He therefore resolved on their extermination . . . each victory of Mahomet over the Meccans was followed by violent measures against the Medinese Israelites . . . his attack on the flourishing Jewish settlement of Khaibar, after the affair of Hodaibiyah, appears to have been practically unprovoked, and designed to satisfy his discontented adherents by an accession of plunder." *(Enc. Brit.* XVII, 404, 406)

The Christian features of the Defamation were of course absent in the Moslem countries, but many local accusations were fabricated to torment the Jews. Thus in Morocco: "If all other means fail for securing rain, they turn all the Jews out of town, and bid them not to return without rain; for they say, though God would not give them rain for their prayers, He will give the Jews rain, to be rid of their importunity, their stinking breath and feet. This was done some time

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ago at Tangier." (J. Windhus, *Journey to Meguinez,* 1721, 458; Cited by A. Cohen, in *Anglo-Jewish Scrapbook,* 87)

The followers of Mahomet were taught to regard the Jews as greater foes than the Christians: "Muhammad finally finds that the Jews and idolators are the greatest enemies of the believers, while the Christians are friendly to Muhammad and his community." *(Enc. of Islam,* IV, 1148). The Koran, the book containing the professed revelations to Mahomet, instructed the Islamic world to "Always expose the House of Israel. These people are swindlers from the first to the last."

There are on record instances of use of the Jews by Mahommedan rulers to perform the customary Scapegoat role. "1804. The bey of Algiria blamed the Jews for the uprising which occurred in his domain and ordered that many of them be flogged and burned and their possessions pillaged." (H. Ellenberg, *Sufferings, Misfortunes and the Defenders of the Jews,* 125)

10. *China, India and Japan*

A different story is to be recorded regarding China and India. Some historians hold that Jews came to China while tending the Babylonian caravans during the captivity in Babylon (586-536 B. C. E.). Others believe the Jews appeared in China in the period of the Chou dynasty (1120-249 B. C. E.); still others maintain that the Jews came there in 231 C. E. fleeing from Persian persecution. Another date of the Jews' entry into China is given as 1163 C. E. At any rate, the Jews lived in China for many centuries—having established a community of Kai-fung-foo. In contrast to the monstrous accusations, debasement, tortures and massacres in the Christian and Mohammedan worlds, in China the Jews "have lived peaceably, enjoying the protection of the authorities and making some slight efforts to spread their tenets." *(Enc. Brit.* "China," VI, 176). The Chinese referred to the Jews simply as "the sect of those who take out the sinew" to make the meat kosher. But the Defamation did not follow on the heels of these Jews and due to its total absence the majority of them "had become merged in the ordinary population." *(Ib.)*

The last Rabbi of the basic Chinese Jews died in 1836. (E. I. Ezra, *Chinese Jews,* 75). In 1840, a few Jewish European families settled in Shanghai. "Jewish efforts to rescue the dying community began in 1900 with the formation by the leaders of the Shanghai Jewish Community of a Society for the Rescue of the Chinese Jews. (An earlier effort in the United States in 1852 never materialized.) This Society invited some of the Kai-fung-foo Jews to Shanghai. Only one aged man and his son came, and they told the committee that while the Kai-fung-foo Jews still existed as a group, all that distinguished them was their name and the fact that they abstained from eating pork. All other Mosaic rites had vanished." *(Univ. J. Enc.* "China," III, 158)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In 1933 the Defamation was used in China for the first time in history, too late to be of basic use to the ruling elements. "Anti-Semitism was unknown in China prior to 1933, although White Russians terrorized the Jews in Manchuria for many years. In 1935 Shanghai was stirred by reports of a ritual murder in a Jewish cemetery. The municipal council investigated and branded the story as false. 1938 and 1939 Jewish leaders in Tiensin were arrested by the Japanese, who seemed to believe that Jews and Communists were synonymous. After the Japanese took over Shanghai the city was frequently flooded with Nazi propaganda, but it made no headway." (159)

In India the Defamation was also never applied. There "the local Jews merged more and more with the Hindus and Mohammedans. Many of them migrated to China and merged with the Chinese." *(Evreiskaia Enc.* VIII, 169)

China and India are historical proof that where the Jews were not used as a scapegoat the "Jewish problem" did not arise.

In Japan too active political anti-Semitism did not operate for almost a thousand years despite the fact that Jews appeared there "as early as the 9th century . . . Anti-Semitism was no problem to the Jews of Japan, most of whom are merchants and professional men, until Japan signed its anti-Soviet pact with Germany in 1939 . . . anti-Jewish feeling grew under the impetus of the Axis pact and Nazi propaganda. Early in 1941 Japan suspended the issuance of further visas to all Jews from Europe." *(Un. J. Enc.* VI, 39, 40)

11. *The Defamation During the Renaissance*

"The art of printing, invented in the 15th Cent., though destined to be the bearer of enlightenment, was at first an agency for disseminating further accusations against the Jews." *(Univ. J. Enc.* I, 352)

The most effective contributors to the Defamation were not the professional, overt anti-Semitic writers but the respected men of letters, science, art, religion and politics. Erasmus, a famous Dutch scholar (1467-1536) said: "What robbery and oppression of the poor there is by the Jews. . . ." Martin Luther in 1543 wrote a pamphlet *About the Jews and Their Lies* in which he said: "And how the Jews love the book of Esther which is so suitable to their bloodthirsty, revengeful, murderous appetite and hope." Luther's principal opponent, John Eck, a Catholic priest, also attacked the Jews. His cry was: "the evil and wickedness brought about by Jews in all the German territories and other kingdoms." (Cited by H. Graetz, *History of the Jews,* IV, 547). Giordano Bruno, Italian philosopher of the Renaissance who was burned at the stake by the Church, added his mite to the Defamation of the Jews: "The most contemptible and rottennest race in the world, in its nature and its impulses the lowest and dirtiest, the torturers of human kind and the dregs of all nations, the Jews are such a diseased, poisonous and dangerous tribe that it deserves retaliation

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

already from the moment of its appearance in the world. This breed, perpetually servile, isolated and intolerable to other nations, beastly hates all of them and in turn rightly and dutifully is despised by them." *(Scapaccio;* Cited by Shmakov in *Jewish Speeches,* R. 180)

During the birth of Capitalism society was fairly saturated with the poison of the Defamation. There appeared such literary dregs as Wagenseil's *Tela Ignea Satanae* (1681) with a vituperative subtitle, "The Horrible Attacks of the Jews upon Christ, God, and the Christian Faith," and Eisenmenger's *Judaism Unmasked* (1700). "As to satires, broadsides, pamphlets, dramatic skits, and caricatures against the Jews, it would take a volume to catalogue and describe this output of dubious wit. . . ." (Lowenthal, 195)

Virtually all the greatest writers and poets of early Capitalism pictured the Jewish group as wicked, although some allowing for exceptions. Thus, John Milton wrote: "A good man is known by his works. Sometimes, however, certain temporary virtues, or semblances of virtues, are discernible even in the wicked; as in Saul, I Sam. XIX and in the Jews, Jer. XXXIV." ("The Christian Doctrine," *The Student's Milton,* 1051)

CHAPTER III.

MARX CONCEALED FROM THE PROLETARIAT A VITAL POLITICAL INSTITUTION UNDER CAPITALISM

1. *In the Light of Marx's Extraordinary Erudition*

THE MARXISTS make a claim that the founder of their movement was one of the greatest students of society. And judging by his works he undoubtedly was. His chief domain was the study of Capitalism, and no diligent critical student of social and political relations in society can fail to note at least vaguely the special role assigned to the Jew by Capitalism. We have shown the pre-Capitalist origin and evolution of the Jewish Scapegoat, and it is inexcusable that Marx criminally ignored this part of social-political history. But he is doubly culpable for concealing the position of the Jews under Capitalism, a system which was his specialty. Henceforth we shall unfold the picture of the Jewish Scapegoat under Capitalism to show another vital truth which Marx deliberately concealed from the proletariat.

2. *The Delusion of Emancipation of the Jewish Scapegoat by the French Revolution*

The bourgeoisie was restricted in its development by numerous Feudal fetters. Before these fetters could be broken a new ideological groundwork had to be laid. Philosophers and literary men arose to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

fulfill this need. They attacked the ideological foundations of Feudalism with one single exception: the *Defamation*. Contrary to the new spirit they retained this part of Feudal ideology. The most shining light of the rising bourgeoisie, Voltaire, wrote: "The Jew is the cruel enemy of all the people." (Cited by L. Abbe Charles, in *Solution de la Questoin Juive,* title page). Voltaire attacked the Jews in other of his works: "The Jewish nation dares to display irreconcilable animosity towards all nations, it rebels against all its benefactors; always superstitious, always jealous of the property of others, always barbarian, it is humble in misfortune and arrogant in well being." *(Essais sur les moeurs,* Chap. XLII). "You'll find the Jews only an ignorant barbarian people which combines within itself since time immemorial the most filthy miserliness with the most revolting superstition and unconquerable hatred towards all peoples who tolerate and enrich it." *(Dictionnaire Philosophique,* Sect. I). Voltaire addressed the Jews directly: "Return as soon as possible to Judea—there you may to your hearts' content carry out in your repulsive Jargon your repulsive music." *(Essais sur les moeurs).* In a letter to a friend dated December 15, 1773, he stated: "Whether these circumcised Jews consider themselves as part of the Naphtoli or Issachar tribe is of little importance; at all events they are the worst connivers that ever defiled the earth's surface with their presence." He attacked the Jews as "the most hateful and most shameful of all minor nations." *(Dieu les hommes).* However, Voltaire was a "decent" fellow after all, for his position regarding the policy the State should assume toward the Jews was: "Il ne faut pourtant pas les bruler"—"Nevertheless they should not be burned." This, in capsule, was Voltaire's disagreement with the Church on the attitude towards the Jews.

Diderot, French philosopher and encyclopedist, contributed anti-Jewish humor in his *Nephew of Ramo.* Diderot's "profound" philosophy regarding the Dutch Jews expressed itself in dividing off a few wealthy shaven ones as apparently honest and putting the bearded mass of Jewry under suspicion of being crooks: "The shaven Jews are rich and appear as honest people; one has to be on his guard with the bearded ones, who are not infinitely scrupulous." *(Voyage de Holland,* 256-7)

Other French "enlighteners" were no better, though less venomous, than Voltaire: "The Jews were the dregs of nations." (M. Helvetius, *A Treatise on Man; His Intellectual Faculties and His Education,* II, 144-5). "To whom gave Jesus the appelation of a race of vipers? Was it to the Pagans, the Essenes, or Sadduces, who denied the immortality of the soul, and even the existence of the Divinity? No: it was to the Pharisees and Jewish priests." (I, 345). "Among certain savages drunkenness attracts respect. Whoever says he is drunk, is declared a prophet, and, like those of the Jews, may commit murder with impunity." (II, 66). D'Holbach asserted: "The Jews do not have any scruples in deceiving the Christians." *(de la Morale et de La*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Politique, I, 36, Note). Holbach said about Moses and the Jews: "In particular he inspired them with a terrible hatred towards the gods of other nations and a refined cruelty towards those who worshipped them . . . in a word he made the Jews monsters of madness and savagery. Filling them with this spirit of destruction he pointed out the countries and possessions of their neighbors to them as an inheritance destined for them by God Himself." *(Le Christianisme devoile,* 35)

Silent about the anti-Semitism of these philosophers, the Marxists have expressed themselves regarding them in terms of highest respect: "The flowering of materialism was engendered by the epoch of preparation of the Great French Revolution, producing a number of first-class philosophers-materialists: Diderot, Helvetius, Holbach." (Bukharin, *Historical Materialism,* R. 57). "In France the materialist philosophers of the eighteenth century (Diderot, Helvetius, Holbach, etc.) —representatives of the revolutionary bourgeoisie—" (Editor's note to Engels' "Ludwig Feuerbach" *Sel. Wks.* I, 428)

In 1787 the royal society of arts and sciences of Metz issued an essay "On the means of rendering the Jews more useful and more happy in France." To this essay, M. Haillecourt, procurer to the Parliament of Metz, responded: "What good does it do to make the Jews useful and happy? Useful, they ruin the artists, the artisans and the businessmen; happy, they plunder the property of the Church. What then should be done to render the other Frenchmen happy? It is very simple, transport them en masse into the deserts of Guiana."

The French aristocracy made an attempt to divert the mass discontent by staging Jewish pogroms: "Since the main center of the Jewish population was in the East, the anti-Semitic directives precisely of this section of France had to create an unfavorable impression upon French society regarding the Jews. This impression could become strengthened, when after the fall of the Bastille, there arose in the entire country disorders which in Alsace were accompanied by Jewish pogroms. . . . True, the anonymous author of 'Letter d'un alsacien sur les Juifs d'Alsace' denied the anti-Semitic character of the 1789 pogroms and saw in them only a skillful maneuver of the counter-revolutionary party. 'To save their castles from the storm arising over entire France—we read in the brochure—the aristocrats have instigated the people against the Jews and sacrificed them to the popular passions.' " *(Ev. Enc.* II, 654)

The aristocracy sought to achieve two aims: "In the first place, to convince the masses that the Church-requisitioned lands would not become the property of the masses, but would fall into the hands of the Jews, whom they hated, if the Jews were to be recognized as French citizens; and second, to convince the Constituent Assembly that the Jews could not and did not wish to be French citizens." (Kulisher, *The Great French Revolution and the Jewish Question,* R. 89-90)

On October 14, 1789 a debate took place in the National Assembly on the question of Jewish disabilities. One of the principal leaders

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Right, L'Abbe Maury, fighting to shipwreck the Revolution, launched a furious attack on the Alsacian Jews who were living in a pogrom atmosphere. "They have made of Alsace a Jewish colony," he cried.

The entire Rightist press, *Le Journal de Louis XVI et son peuple, La Gazette de Paris, Le Journal Generale, Le Mercure de France* and all the other organs of the aristocracy and the royalist bourgeoisie attempted to divert the aroused masses from the old regime to the Jewish Scapegoat. Stories about the alleged usurpatory aims of the Jews were freely circulated: "The Jews of Paris have directed their attention to the Church of the Jesuits of St. Anthony in order to transform it into a synagogue." *(Le Courier Francais,* April 17, 1790)

"The National Assembly was suddenly branded as Jewish, and the clerical reaction found an appropriate banner as a cover for its avaricious aims. Under the pretext of saving the holy Catholic religion, France was inundated with libelous, slanderous literature, and with newspapers especially created by the clericals for the struggle against the Revolution, which every day more and more strengthened this muddy stream of lies and slander . . . L'Abbe Peretnee asserted that the Church lands were being sold for the exclusive purpose of satisfying the Jewish creditors, and *Le Rodeur Francais* said that the Jews gave the National Assembly 2 million francs so as to be equalized in their rights with the native French." *(Ev. Enc.* II, 655)

The efforts of the aristocracy and clergy to stem the Revolution by using the Jewish Scapegoat met with failure due to a number of factors. Most important of these was that the bulk of the bourgeoisie was interested in eliminating, not in preserving the "Ancient Regime." The bourgeoisie was establishing its political and economic domination using the motto "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." It had to pretend that the worker, the peasant, and even the most despised of all creatures, the Jew, would become free and equal brothers by supporting the rising French bourgeoisie. Yet, it was a difficult matter for the French bourgeois representatives in the National Assembly to overcome the centuries' old antipathy: "For two years a bitter battle was waged to overcome the opposition to the emancipation of the large majority of the French Jews. Only on September 27, 1791 were all the Jews in France given civil rights . . ." *(Jewish Social Studies,* Oct. 1945, 291). However, many people felt that the granting of citizenship rights to the Jews was more nominal than actual. "Even Marat agreed that in receiving citizenship rights the Jews would hardly factually benefit by the favorable wishes of the lawmakers." *(Ev. Enc.* II, 657). The Jewish bourgeoisie in France was treated with official tolerance but unofficial disdain, and was occasionally attacked openly: "The participation of several wealthy Jews in supplying the Army gave rise here and there to anti-Semitic sentiments. Thus, for example, the Department of Meurthe decided 'to banish the entire Jewish nation.' This decision was approved." (659). It was not carried

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

out, however, except on a local scale under the pretext of safeguarding the Army of the Revolution against the Jewish speculators. "The people's representative Loran . . . issued a proclamation at Mons forbidding the Jews to follow the Northern Army on peril of death." *(Ib.)*

However, very little anti-Jewish legislation and persecution was attempted prior to the rise of Napoleon to power. Napoleon has been portrayed by some students as a friend of the Jews. Records reveal him to be a contributor to the Defamation: "The Jews are a nation capable of the most horrible crimes." After he became a dictator, Napoleon "resolved to adopt severest measures against the Jews." (661)

3. *Capitalism Takes Over the Jewish Scapegoat Institution*

Napoleon represented the bourgeois order and his anti-Jewish legislation was an expression of the fact that Capitalism took over the Ancient institution of the Jewish Scapegoat.

The bourgeoisie in its rise enlisted any and all elements in overthrowing the Feudal system. But once it had achieved control of the State it had to consolidate its position against the potential threat of the working class. Capitalism had to be safeguarded by all possible means at hand. The bourgeoisie began to refurbish the basic Defamation. Some of the old accusations, such as the charge of causing the Black Death, were of necessity discarded, but many new ones were added. The responsibility for the evils inherent in the capitalist system was pinned on the Jewish bourgeoisie and by extension upon the Jews in general. Again social disasters were blamed on the Jews. Thus: "In the famine of 1816 whole families died of hunger, and the notion that the Jews contributed to 'over-population' became embedded in the minds of all classes." (E. Sterling, *Historica Judaica,* Oct. 1950, 108). The most influential Defamers were again the great men of literature, art, science, music, philosophy, Christian religion, Left bourgeois "atheism" and capitalist politics. Goethe, "Germany's greatest man of letters," author, poet, philosopher and statesman, was one of the leading figures that conducted a campaign against the Jewish Scapegoat. "In the parliament of the Great Dutchy of Saxe-Weimar it was none other than Goethe who lifted his voice against the Jews, and their condition in 1823 grew considerably worse." *(Ev. Enc.* II, 690)

Victor Hugo attacked the Jewish Scapegoat, approved the massacres of the Jews by the Crusaders and said: "It would be possible to produce an interesting book about the Jews. They were deeply hated, but they were extremely hateful. They were held in great contempt, but they were very vile." *(Literature et Philosophie Me'l'ees,* 10; Cited by G. Kohut in *Victor Hugo and the Jews,* I, 6)

In private channels anti-Semitism flowed more freely. For instance, John Ruskin, speaking of the Ephesian Goddess, bracketed *all Jews* with money and prostitutes: "—and her temple, which you

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

a/5.0
ACCEPT-

luckily liken to the Bank of England, was in fact what that Establishment would be as the recognized place of pious pilgrimage for all Jews, infidels, and prostitutes in this realm of England." (Letter to Rev. Malleson, April 23, 1881)

Many composers of the bourgeois epoch have been open or secret, mild or strong Defamers. Beethoven wrote with respect to a Jewish publisher: "Schlesinger, at any rate, will not receive anything from me, as he has played me a Jewish trick." (Letter to C. F. Peters, July 26, 1822. A. C. Kalischer, *Beethoven's Letters,* II, 201). Having some business conflict with this publisher, Beethoven appealed to a senator "to devote a little attention to my advantage against this Jewish publisher." (Letter to Senator Brentano, Nov. 28, 1820, 177). Franz Liszt, one of the greatest Hungarian composers, vituperated: "The day will come when all nations amidst which the Jews are dwelling will have to raise the question of their wholesale expulsion, a question which will be one of life or death, good health or chronic disease, peaceful existence or perpetual social fever."

Chopin, the famous Polish composer, was imbued with "fanatical contempt for Jews—unless they happened to be a Rothschild, a Mendelssohn or a Heine. He used the epithets 'Jew' and 'pig' interchangeably for anyone who incurred, even unwittingly, his disfavor." (W. Brockway and H. Weinstock, *Men of Music,* 321; cited by E. Ziegmeister, *The Music Lover's Handbook,* 473)

Chaikovsky indicated his aversion for the Jews: "As my sister's house is crowded, she has prepared a quiet separate house for me—very pleasant. It is a clean cozy little cabin, rather far from the settlement and the Jews, with a view of the village and the winding river in the distance." (Letter to Nadejda von Meck, April 24, 1878, C. D. Bowen, *Beloved Friend,* 239)

Sir Walter Scott, in a letter on July 24, 1817 wrote: "I think Miss Edgeworth's last work delightful, though Jews will always be to me Jews. One does not naturally and easily combine with their habits and pursuits any great liberality of principle, although certainly it may, and I believe does, exist in many individual instances. They are money-makers and money-brokers by profession, and it is a trade which narrows the mind. I own I breathed more freely when I found Miss Montenero was not an actual Jewess." *(Familiar Letters of Sir Walter Scott,* I, 436). And Scott put his ideology into his literature. In *Ivanhoe* he had his character say—"A dog Jew." "The swineherd a fit usher of the Jew," "Unbelieving dog."

The publication of *Oliver Twist* by Charles Dickens (1838-39) caused a violent stir among the leading Jewish bourgeois elements. Protests against his anti-Semitic portrayal of the "Jew" Fagin were addressed to Dickens. In reply Dickens disclaimed anti-Semitism and pointed out that in his works he had also portrayed bad Christians. The correspondent to whom he offered this explanation replied that, inversely, Dickens had pictured both bad and good Christians but he

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

had never shown a good Jew. Many years later, in an attempt to clear himself publicly, Dickens wrote *Our Mutual Friend* (1865) in which he gave a caricature of a Jew directly opposite of Fagin. However, Dicken's true attitude toward the Jews is revealed in his Defamatory hint that the Jews were clipping gold coins. In an article "The Old Lady in Threadneedle Street" *(Household Words* #15), Dickens said: "The future history of this metal is explained in three sentences: It is coined at the Mint, distributed to the Public, worn by friction (or sweated by Jews), till it becomes light." Protests of the Jewish bourgeoisie followed. *(Jewish Chronicle,* July 26, 1850)

The strongest attack of Dickens' on the Jews is a story he privately wrote for the "education" of his children ten years after *Oliver Twist.* It was titled *The Life of Our Lord* and was kept secret in the Dickens family for almost a century, until it was released for publication in 1934.

Even such "advanced" people as the authoress George Sand, who was a St. Simonist, "wrote to a friend in April 1857 that she saw in the Jew the type of man who aspires to become the king of the world and threatens to murder Jesus Christ, i.e. the ideal. George Sand expresses the fear lest within fifty years France become Jewish." *(Jewish Social Studies,* IX, 41)

In Russia the great poet of the age of Catherine, Derzhavin, was not merely a Defamer of the Jews but an active supporter of the Blood Accusation against them in the Sennensk Case in 1799. *(Ev. Enc.* VII, 112)

Many bourgeois revolutionists were determined to deny the Jews bourgeois freedoms. The leader of the Decembrists, Pestel, opposed granting civil rights to the Jews in Russia and sought to render them "harmless" with respect to the Christians. (U. Gessen, *The History of Jews in Russia,* R. 175)

Another eminent contributor to the Defamation was the greatest Russian poet, Pushkin. In his *Black Shawl* the Jew is a despicable informer who receives gold and curses for his base services; in the *Avaricious Knight* a Jew-usurer suggests to a young knight, who is hard pressed for money, that he poison his rich miserly father. In Pushkin's works the Jew is an inhuman creature, a "cur" a "snake" a "Judas." In Pushkin's ideology spy and Jew are synonymous. One day in 1827 while Pushkin was on a journey he met a group of political prisoners—Decembrists. Among them was an old friend of his from the Lyceum. Pushkin later wrote: "I took him to be a Zhid, and the inseparable definitions of Jew and spy made the usual impression upon me. I turned my back upon them." (Cited in *Evrieskaia Letopis,* 1923, Petrograd-Moscow, I, 63). Lermontov also portrayed the Jew as a spy. *(Sashka).* These are just a few examples, for this characterization was widespread: "Behind the legend about the universal Jewish spying there is an age-old historical tradition. The Jew-spy was a required

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lla/5.0
'_ACCEPT-

accessory of war tales and anecdotes. From there it passed into literature." *(Ev. L.* 64)

Turgenev used the Defamation to describe the nature of one of his characters—"Was an avaricious soul, really just like a Zhid's." *(Brigadier).* Turgenev also helped to spread the accusation that the Jew-usurpers planned to rob the whole world. In his *Literary Reminiscences,* Rachel, a Jew, is addressed by one of the characters in these words: "Yes, this is a force. The force and flower of Zhidovism which has now captured all the pockets of the world and will soon get possession of all the rest of the wealth." Gogol brought in the Jews' supposed trait of refusing to part with anything unless they got money for it: "Have mercy, brother, what sort of Zhid-inclination in you! You simply ought to give them to me." *(Dead Souls).* Gogol supplied real pogrom humor in his *Taras Bulba.* Without a word to indicate the tragic lot of the oppressed group, he pictured the killing and drowning of the Jews by his beloved Cossacks as an affair of boisterous merriment. Pogrom humor used by Gogol had its origin in the Church institutions. "There are many instances of the drollery of Jew-drowning in the annals of monkish historians." (A. White, *Modern Jew,* 122)

4. *The Defamation in Organized Form*

A powerful impetus to the establishment of the Jewish-Scapegoat as a permanent institution of Capitalism was given in the 1870's in the German Empire. Capitalist society had always been Jew-conscious, but in Germany the campaign in that period reached a paroxysm of frenzy. "In 1873, partly as a result of the speculation and partly in consequence of a world-crisis, the Great Panic (Der grosse Krach) ruined not only the speculators but a large portion of the population. It was Germany's first taste of modern capitalism on a decent scale. The Jews were immediately accused of the disaster." (Lowenthal, 265)

In 1879 the German bourgeoisie engineered a new anti-Semitic campaign in preparation for future contingencies: "Towards the end of 1879 it spread with sudden fury over the whole of Germany. This outburst, at a moment when no new financial scandals or other illustrations of Semitic demoralization and domination were before the public, has never been fully explained. It is impossible to doubt, however, that the secret springs of the new agitation were more or less directly supplied by Prince Bismarck himself." *(Enc. Brit.* II, 136). It was in this period that the word "anti-Semitism," stressing the "race" not the religion of the Scapegoat, was coined by a Hamburg journalist Wilhelm Marr in a sensational book *The Victory of Judaism Over Germanism.* The book went through nine editions in a few months.

In October 1879 an Anti-Semitic League was launched in Berlin with a program of gradual political and economic strangulation of the Jews. *(Nineteenth Century,* Feb. 1881, 344). The German bour-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

geoisie, cognizant of the fact that the danger to its social system came from the *proletariat*, attired the anti-Semitic movement in "proletarian" garb. For the first time in history the Defamers assumed the name of "Socialists" and "workers." (Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*). A party was formed, "The Christian Social Workingmen's Union" headed by one Adolph Stocker. His popularity rapidly rose to such heights that he was elected to the Reichstag.

Thus, organized anti-Semitism of the capitalist era began in "the most enlightened nation in the world" (Engels), with the largest Marxist proletariat. The influence of the "new" movement spread throughout the entire Western world, but—"Most serious have been the effects of German anti-Semitic teachings on the political and social life of the countries adjacent to the empire—Russia, Austria, France." (*Enc. Brit.* II, 138)

In England the attack on the Scapegoat did not spare even Prime Minister Disraeli knighted as Lord Beaconfield: "The circumstance that at the time of the rise of German anti-Semitism a premier of Hebrew race, Lord Beaconsfield, was in power first suggested the Jewish bogey to English political extremists. The Eastern crisis of 1876-1878, which was regarded by the Liberal party as primarily a struggle between Christianity, as represented by Russia, and a degrading Semitism, as represented by Turkey, accentuated the anti-Jewish feeling, owing to the anti-Russian attitude adopted by the government. Violent expression to the ancient prejudices against the Jews was given by Sir J. G. Tollemache Sinclair (*A Defence of Russia*, 1877). Mr. T. P. O'Connor, in a life of Lord Beaconsfield (1878), pictured him as the instrument of the Jewish people, 'moulding the whole policy of Christendom to Jewish aims.' Professor Goldwin Smith, in several articles in the *Nineteenth Century* (1878, 1881 and 1882) sought to synthetize the growing anti-Jewish feeling by adopting the nationalist theories of the German anti-Semites. This movement did not fail to find an equivocal response in the speeches of some of the leading Liberal statesmen; but on the country generally it produced no effect. It was revived when the persecutions in Russia threatened England with a great influx of Polish Jews, whose mode of life was calculated to lower the standard of living in the industries in which they were employed, and it has left its trace in the anti-alien legislation of 1905." (145)

Quite characteristic was Lord Beaconsfield's reaction to the attack. In his novel *Endymion* published in 1880 he actually attempted to work hand in glove with the overt Defamers. In this novel one of his characters instructs a young man in the "facts" of life: "But the Semites now exercise a vast influence over affairs by their smallest though most peculiar family, the Jews. There is no race gifted with so much tenacity, and such skill in organization. These qualities have given them an unprecedented hold over property and illimitable credit. As you advance in life, and get experience in affairs, the Jews will cross

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

you everywhere. They have long been stealing into our secret diplomacy which they have almost appropriated; in another quarter of a century they will claim their share of open government." *(Endymion,* 252)

Since Beaconsfield did not produce a character in any of his novels to expose and counter-act this virus, his works fall into the category of indirect Defamation literature.

"The Anti-Semites, realizing their increasing strength, held their first 'International Congress' in 1881 at Dresden. It was attended by 300 members, including Austrians, Hungarians, and Russians, and it resolved to issue a 'Manifesto to the Governments and Peoples of the Christian States endangered by Judaism.'" (I. Cohen, *Anti-Semitism in Germany,* 11)

In France Edouard Drumont wrote a book *Jewish France,* which made German anti-Semitic literature look pale by comparison. The book's success was facilitated by the failure of a Gentile-owned banking house, Union Generale. "The cry was at once raised that the collapse was due to the maneuvers of the Jews, and a strong anti-Semitic feeling manifested itself in clerical and aristocratic circles. In 1886 violent expression was given to this feeling in a book since become famous, *La France juive,* by Edouard Drumont (b. 1884). The author illustrated the theories of German anti-Semitism with a *chronique scandaleuse* full of piquant personalities, in which the corruption of French national life under Jewish influences was painted in alarming colors. The book was read with avidity by the public, who welcomed its explanations of the obviously growing debauchery." *(Enc. Brit.* II, 143)

The storm against the Jews reached its highest intensity during the Dreyfus frameup. The repercussions of this affair were felt around the globe. Even in remote Transvaal the bourgeoisie introduced anti-Jewish legislation: "When in 1899 a new constitution was being drafted in Bloemfontein the Jews staged a number of protests against the fact that Kruger in the newly proposed constitution deprived the Jews who had arrived from Russia and Rumania of general citizenship rights." *(Ev. Enc.* XV, 2). Anti-Semitic historians put the blame for the Boer War on the Jewish bourgeoisie: ". . . the great ordeal of the South African War, openly and undeniably provoked and promoted by Jewish interests in South Africa . . ." (Hilaire Belloc, *The Jews,* 50)

5. *The Reaction of the Jewish Bourgeoisie*

The Jewish capitalists played a craven role in the anti-Semitic uproar which began in the 1870's. Their spokesmen did not expose the fact that the persecution of the Jews had become a political necessity to the world bourgeoisie. Adopting a policy of appeasement, the Jewish bourgeoisie in France was willing to sacrifice Dreyfus to the generals who framed him, hoping that through this maneuver the

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

.0
.CCEPT-

anti-Semitic angle of the case would be eliminated. "The desire to let the matter rest was not uncommon among French Jews, especially the richer Jews." (Brogan, *The Development of Modern France,* VII, ch. 1. Cited by Hanna Arendt in *Jewish Soc. Studies,* July 1942, 220). The Jewish members of the French Chamber of Deputies, having been elected as Jews and entrusted by the voters to carry on a struggle against anti-Semitism, presented a sorry sight. While the Chamber was in an uproar—"The Jewish deputies in the French Chamber maintained a dead silence during the debates on the Dreyfus case." *(Ev. Enc.* VII, 101). One Jewish deputy openly sided with the generals: "The Jewish deputy Klotz declared: 'Above all I am a patriot, and from the very beginning I condemned the revolting campaign against the Army of the Republic and declare now that I will always vote against reviewing the Dreyfus Case.' " (337). Some Jewish newspapermen and owners, pretending not to see the anti-Semitic nature of the *Affaire,* or, perhaps, hoping to cover up this basic feature, attacked Dreyfus. *The Encyclopedia Britannica* actually accepted this counterfeit for good coin: "That in its later stages it was not a question of race-persecution was seen in the curious phenomenon of journals owned or edited by Jews leading the outcry against the Jewish officer and his defenders." (X, 883)

It is apropos to point out that in virtually all countries Jewish bourgeois parliamentarism was an important aid to open and concealed anti-Semitism. "In the German Reichstag and the Austrian Reichstag the struggle against anti-Semitism was conducted in the main by non-Jews . . . When the House of Commons adopted the bill limiting the immigration of foreigners, i.e. in the first instance the Jews, the Jewish members were silent." *(Ev. Enc.* VII, 101-2). "Much controversy is raging in some of our foreign Jewish contemporaries regarding the attitude of Jewish M.P.'s to the anti-Semitic movement. Among the Galician members of the Austrian Parliament there are eleven Jews, yet, it is affirmed, none of them has raised his voice against the hostile criticism of the Jew-haters, nor has any protested in Parliament against the fatal riots at Chodorow. Not a single 'interpellation' has been made by any of these members who were returned by constituencies like Kolomea, Brody and Tarnopol, which were mainly peopled by Jews. A similar charge is brought against the Jewish Deputies in France." *(Jewish Chronicle,* Aug. 27, 1897)

This pattern was followed in Russia. We have seen how in the First Duma a Jewish bourgeois deputy threatened to fight if his family were attacked in a pogrom. But that was as far as he or any other Jewish deputy went. The political leader of the Jewish bourgeoisie made the following admission in the Duma: "From this platform from which there has been so much spoken about political freedoms, we Jews, representatives of the most tortured nationality in the country, did not say a word about ourselves even once because we

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

thought it was not fitting to speak here of social inequality." (M. Vinaver in First Duma, Cited by S. Dubnov in *The Newest History of the Jewish People,* R. III, 402). In the next three Dumas the Jewish Deputies feared to open their mouths: "Jewish deputies were the natural center into which poured numerous complaints and petitions. But the political role of this center was extremely insignificant. In the Duma the deputies did not dare to call attention to their existence by means of a protest. It was sufficient for a Jewish deputy to ascend the tribune when the Black Hundreds with their yells and hisses would drive the diffident speaker back into the backyard of the Cadet Party where the 'Jews' led an ignominious existence." *(Evreiskaia Letopis,* 1923, II, 46)

A characteristic feature in the attitude of the Jewish bourgeoisie towards the anti-Semites is expressed in its local opportunism. In the early 1900's while the pogrom tide was rising in Russia, anti-Semitism temporarily receded in Germany. This latter fact brought the opportunism of the German Jewish bourgeoisie into the open: "The very fact that Jews, at the reballoting, chose in several districts to give their vote to an anti-Semite, rather than to his Socialist or Polish rival, speaks volumes for the comparative impotence of anti-Semitism as a political power." *(American Jewish Year Book* 1903-1904, 26)

6. *Capitalism and the Blood Accusation*

Since the bourgeoisie, in taking control of society, took over virtually intact the structure of superstitious beliefs and adapted the Defamation and the Jewish Scapegoat to its political needs, it could not leave out a central feature of the Defamation, the Ritual Murder Charge.

A sensational case occurred in 1840, creating a great stir in the entire Occidental world. "On February 5 a Capuchin, Peter Thomas, dissapeared in Damascus, and since trouble comes in large packages, soon after, on the Island of Rhodes, a Greek hanged himself. The gossip of the local monastery brotherhood spread that the Capuchin and the Greek were victims of the Jews. In Syria and in Turkey great agitation developed and the most prominent Jews were imprisoned and subjected to torture; even children were tortured by starvation in an attempt to force confessions out of them." (H. Ellenberg, 130)

The Damascus affair involved various governments and the Vatican. Incidentally, a noteworthy paradox occurred. In the "Damascus Affair . . . For political reasons of its own, Russia also took the Jewish side in this instance." (S. Grayzel, *A History of the Jews,* 634). The political reason, of course, was the Tsar's anti-Turkish foreign policy. But while the Tsarist Government was "against" the Blood Accusation in Damascus, it was busy cultivating the age-long calumny inside Russia. Under special instructions, one V. E. Dahl, produced a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

book entitled: *Investigation into the Killing of Christian Infants by Jews and Use of their Blood. Printed by the Order of Minister of Internal Affairs. 1844.*

The Damascus Affair afforded the professional Defamers an opportunity to pour out volumes of anti-Jewish propaganda. Even "respectable" pens lent strength to the Blood Accusation, for example, Victor Hugo in his play *Les Burgraves* (1843). When Jewish bourgeois leaders protested, he wrote a very ambiguous reply to *The Archives Israelites,* a French Jewish publication.

Some Jewish Liberals would not accept his thinly disguised support to the Blood Accusation. But at the same time, instead of exposing the calumny as a deliberate practice of all the ruling classes, a critic has called it "senseless":

"That Victor Hugo should have lent his God-given powers to a wider circulation of a cruel slander,—knowing it to be a senseless myth, a superstitious survival, which, alas! still claims its annual victims during the Passover season—is a fact hard to reconcile with his otherwise amicable relations to certain distinguished Jews." (G. Kohut, *Victor Hugo and the Jews,* II 5-6)

In 1871 Hugo was elected to the Paris Commune. Ten years later, after the 1881 massacres of Jews in Russia, he produced a play *Torquemada.* The play bore no direct relation to or explanation for the pogroms in Russia and by implication even absolved the Tsar of the crime, for instead of presenting *Torquemada* as one of the blackest characters of the Church, Hugo transformed "the most monstrous historic representative of Christian or Catholic diabolatry into the likeness of a terribly benevolent and a tragically magnificent monomaniac." *(Enc. Brit.* XIII, 864). This explodes Hugo's pretense that he was making drama out of actual historical facts.

In 1876 an active Russian anti-Semite, Lutostansky, put out a two volume collection of cases of Blood Accusations with comments calculated to whip up a fiery hatred against the Jews. The book exerted such a fascination on the Tsar's son, the future Alexander III, that he sent personal thanks to Lutostansky.

An average non-Jewish person, who knew little of the role of the Jews in society in the past two thousand and more years and hardly anything of Jewish ritual, would be staggered and probably convinced by Lutostansky's collection. For many centuries the Jewish spokesmen sought to disprove the Ritual Murder Charge by citing the Hebrew law which prohibited the use of blood in food, pointing out that even a blood-stained egg was on the forbidden list. In vain. The Defamers argued that the Hebrew law did not specifically prohibit the use of *human* blood for ritual purposes (N. Butmi, *Dogma and Blood,* R.). Moreover the ruling groups could count on finding Jewish apostates to support the libel. Lutostansky's two-volume collection of official records of supposed ritual murders by Jews was overwhelming. The reader was presented with a uniform pattern

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

running for many centuries and consisting of numerous "cases" like the following:

"In 1067 in Prague (Bohemia) six Jews, sewn up in bags, were drowned for drawing the blood out of a three-year old baby and sending it to other Jews in Trevis." *(About the Utilization of Christian Blood by the Jews (Talmudist Sectators) for Ritual Purposes,* II, 3)

One story of ritual murder in Lutostansky's book was so graphically drawn that he decided to include it in his later work, *The Zhids and Ritual Murders of Christian Infants.* The incident is entitled "The Torture by the Zhids and the Death of the Infant Catholic Saint Simon of Trent in Ritual Service." Some of the details are worth citing to illustrate how the Russian population of all classes was being incited against the Jews:

"Great was the joy of the Zhids when they entered the synagogue that night because they had succeeded in catching a victim. Having seized the innocent infant, the Jew Samuel removed his little dress, tied his throat and fastened a handkerchief over his mouth so that he shouldn't cry. Then he ordered the others to hold the little legs and hands and, spreading the child over a large basin, took a knife and opened a vein in his throat somewhat on a side. The blood streamed into the basin. Samuel took a pair of scissors and began to cut little bits of flesh from the face and dropped them into the pan. This was done in turn by all the other Zhids . . . then Tobias, sitting himself down near Samuel, ordered that the half-dead infant be handed over to him and he together with Samuel spread it crosswise and ordered everybody to stick it with two needles begining at the head and ending with the feet. Only God was a witness to the Zhids torturing the little baby, singing, 'just as we murdered Jesus, the Christian God, so we will kill it, and let all our enemies be damned for eternity . . .' Next day, on Good Friday, a search was made for the baby by the police . . . On Sunday the Jews, realizing that everybody suspected them, met in a council . . . and decided to put the little dress back on it and throw it into the river which was flowing by their houses and where it was dammed with an iron grate . . .

At that time the Bishop of the city was Johannes VI Hinderbach. When one of the murderers, the Zhid Tobias, came to him and said that the baby had been carried near the synagogue by the water and gotten stuck in the grate, the Bishop ordered the governor of Trent, Jacob de Sporo, and the city judge, John de Salis, to go down to the river and verify the Zhid's story. They went and indeed found the body of the infant-martyr and carried it to the church of St. Peter. Next they seized the criminal Zhids and brought them up for questioning . . . The local court authorities, in line with the sternness of the law, condemned the murderers to death. The infant Simon was canonized by the Roman Church and made a saint. His remains up to this very moment repose in the church of St. Peter in Trent on the border of Germany and France." *(Zhids and the Ritual Mur*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ders of Christian Infants, R. 17-18). Another variation of this tale was given in 1872, four years before Lutostansky, by an English novelist and writer on religious topics, Rev. S. Baring-Gould. Writing in a bourgeois-democratic country, Baring-Gould was clever enough to leave himself an out by inserting one short phrase which could be interpreted to mean that he himself did not believe the appalling tale. However, in his detailed and graphic description of the case he left a strong impression that the Jews actually had murdered the boy and definitely for ritual purposes. *(Lives of the Saints,* III, 447)

Certain details omitted by Baring-Gould, Lutostansky, by the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (XV, 36) and by others, were supplied by some historians. Thus: "In the midst of these commotions came the news of the affair at Trent. The Jews of the Tirolean city were living in harmonious and amicable relations with their Christian neighbors, when the fanatical Franciscan monk, Bernadinus of Feltre, came to town . . .

"A week before Easter, a Christian boy of three years old, Simon by the name, was drowned in the river Adige. As soon as he was missed the preacher charged the Jews with having crucified him. Two days later, the body was found on the bank of the river, close to the dwelling of a Jew . . . A Jewish apostate testified to the use of Christian blood by the Jews . . . the accused withstood the most terrible tortures. At last, their power of resistance was broken . . . The result was that all the Jews of Trent, barring four who accepted baptism, were burned at the stake.

"Hinderbach and the Dominican monks spread stories of miraculous manifestations at the grave of the 'martyred' boy. It made no difference that an investigation by the papal legate proved the whole affair a tissue of falsehoods and that pope Sixtus IV in his bull of October 10, 1475 forbade the veneration of the child. A second proceding also cleared the Jews. Nevertheless, a commission of cardinals, headed by an intimate friend of Bernadinus, found a verdict exculpating the bishop. In a decree of June 20, 1478, the pope gave it confirmation. All through Germany the libel was believed. At Frankfort, by the side of the bridge leading across the Main, a memorial column was erected, with pictures of Christian children being tortured by unsightly Jews and an inscription breathing hatred against the Jewish people." (M. Margolis and A. Marx, *A History of the Jewish People,* 417-18)

7. *The Popes Upholding the Blood Accusation Against the Jews*

There are several instances on record of the heads of the Roman Catholic Church participating in Blood Accusations against the Jewish Scapegoat. One of the leading Defamers testifies:

"Sixtus IV approved in his Bull XII, Kal. July, 1478, of the conduct of the Bishop who dealt with the Jews in the St. Simon case

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

at Trent. The Jews endeavored to enlist Sixtus IV on their side by pointing out that he had suspended the cult of St. Simon of Trent; this was done by Sixtus IV solely as a disciplinary measure, for Simon had not yet been beatified by papal authority, but was being made the center of a local cult.

"Gregory XIII recognized Simon as a martyr and himself visited the shrine. Sixtus V ratified the cult of Simon in 1588, allowing the celebration of mass in his name. This is confirmed as a fact by Benedict XIV, who in a Bull Beatus Andreas (1788, Venice, IV, p. 101 seq.) beatified both Simon and Andreas, two boys murdered by the Jews 'in hatred of the faith of Jesus Christ'; 'the Jews,' he said, 'used every means to escape the just punishment that they had merited and to escape the just anger of the Christians.' " (A. S. Leese, *Jewish Ritual Murder,* 46. Cited by Rev. I. B. Pranaitis in *The Talmud Unmasked,* Appendix II, 99)

Not only was the child canonized but so was the monk who framed the Jews of Trent: "Thus it came about that evenutally, through a papal bull (June 20, 1478), the process against the Jews of Trent was proclaimed as properly and rightly imposed *(rite et recte factum),* and that Bernadinus de Feltre and Simon of Trent were made saints by Pope Gregory XIII, and that the former received the reputation of prophet and the latter that of martyr. The church of St. Peter at Trent has a chapel of St. Simon of Trent." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* IX, 544)

What could impress a religious Christian, even a non-Catholic, more than the fact that the highest dignitaries of the Roman Church officially recognized the Ritual Murder Charge against the Jews as valid and canonized the alleged victims! In addition to St. Simon of Trent (1475) and St. Andreas of Rinn (1462) there were St. Lorenzino, St. Ursula (mentioned in Benedict XIV *Beatus Andreas),* St. Richard of Pontois (1179), St. Rodbertus (1181), St. William of Norwich (1104), St. Hugo of Lincoln (1255), St. Dominuculus of Saragossa, St. Werner of Oberwessel (1286), St. Rudolph of Berne (1287), St. Christopher of Toledo (1490) and a host of other infants canonized as "martyrs" of Christianity, victims, presumably, of Jewish Ritual Murder: "In 1598 by the blessing of the Pope (Clemens VIII—G. S.) monuments were erected to many of the infant-martyrs and even in many churches there are many little coffins. In prayers the Church commemorates the anniversaries of their terrible death." (Lutostansky, *Zhids and Ritual Murder of Christian Infants,* R. 11)

How conscious the Church was in pursuing this criminal policy can be gleaned from Christian sources which record an equivocal attitude of Pope Benedict XIV: "Andrew of Rinn. A. C. July 12, 1459-1462. A boy aged three, alleged to have been put to death by Jews out of hatred of Christ at Rinn, near Innsbruck. The facts are doubtful. Benedict XIV allowed the continuation of the local *cultus*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

but refused to proceed to Andrew's canonization." (*The Book of Saints,* Macmillan Co. 1947, 49)

The Jewish bourgeoisie often sought refutation of the Blood Accusation from the Vatican which, occasionally, responded and seemingly absolved the Jews of the age-long libel. In consequence the bourgeois Liberals, Jews and non-Jews, in answering the attacks of the Defamers, would point to the action of the few "fair-minded" popes, showing a special fondness for Innocent IV. However, their praise of Innocent IV is actually nothing more than a whitewash of his vicious anti-Jewish policy which had been fully expressed in his upholding of the institution of the badge, his consent to the expulsion of the Jews from Vienna (1253) and other acts of persecution. It is true that Innocent IV in one of the two bulls on the Blood Accusation appeared to condemn it as a false charge, but the document was so cleverly worded that it permitted the professional Defamers to interpret it their own way. One of them writes:

"The bulls to which people like to refer belong to the Popes Innocent IV, Martinus V and Paul III. Of these the most favorable to the Jews can be regarded as the two bulls of Pope Innocent IV . . . In this bull, despite all our desire, it is impossible to find anything except prohibition to accuse the Jews of murdering Christians and to kill and rob them on this basis without definite evidence, that is, without a trial and investigation." (N. Butmi, 39-40). Pope Paul III in his bull of May 12, 1540 objected to the *sweeping* charge against the Jews, and, for political reasons, criticised those nobles who made use of the accusation for their private gain: "People blinded by avarice make a sweeping accusation that the Jews use Christian blood, in order to seize their property." (Cited by Usov 27). Pope Gregory X in 1272 declared: "It sometimes happens that certain Christians lose their Christian children. The charge is then made against the Jews by their enemies that they have stolen and slain these children in secret, and have sacrificed the heart and blood . . . We accordingly have determined that no Christian shall be allowed to make any allegations against the Jews on such a pretext. We command, moreover, that the Jews imprisoned on this account shall be released from prison, and that they shall not be arrested again on such groundless charge *unless* (which we think impossible) they are captured in flagrant crime." (Cited in *The Ritual Murder Libel,* Report of Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli, 21-22. Our emph.—G. S.). The "unless" was of course the loophole through which an aristocrat or a priest could frame the Jews on a charge of ritual murder.

The Defamers had a powerful point of agitation against the Jews by citing the incontrovertible truth that the most "fairminded" popes had never repudiated the Ritual Murder Charge and that, therefore, the Church stood on this accusation against the Jews: "But if even the most favorable papal bulls for the Jews do not contain, as we have seen, a direct refutation of ritual murders, then

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

there are bulls (about these the defenders of the Jews prefer not to speak) in which the existence of ritual murders among the Jews is recognized as a fully established and proved fact." (Butmi, 42). At best, a skeptical person would conclude that there was at one time or another a division of opinion in the Church, with a handful of popes declaring the Ritual Murder Charge false while more than two-hundred and sixty pontiffs upheld it. The hypocrisy of Innocent IV and of other "friends" of the Scapegoat among the popes emerges into full view when it is recalled that they retained as "martyrs" *all* the canonized infants and adults supposedly murdered by the Jews for ritual purposes.

There have never been fundamental disagreements in the basic position of the Church on the Blood Accusation just as there have been none on the "Jews-killed-our-Lord" accusation. Even in the period of the so-called "emancipation," following the French Revolution, the popes gave the Blood Accusation direct or indirect support. Leese records with relish: "Pius VII, 24 November, 1805, confirmed a decree of the Congregation of Rites of 31st of August according to the Church at Saragossa the right to honor Dominiculus, killed by the Jews in hatred of the faith of Jesus Christ. He also authorized for the Church at Toledo the same privileges in respect to St. Christopher, the boy crucified by the Jews near that place in 1490. In 1867 the Congregation of Rites authorized the cult of Lorenzino, at Vicenza, Padua, ritually murdered by Jews.

"Gregory XVI, also, gave his support to the anti-Jewish accusers when he honored Gougenot des Mousseaux by making him a Chevailer of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, in reward for writing his book, *Le Juif, le Judaisme at la Judaisation des Peuples Chretiens,* in which Gougenot des Mousseaux devoted a chapter charging the Jews with Ritual Murder of Christians for the sake of their blood . . . Remember that although other murdered boys, victims of Jewish Ritual Murder, have been regarded in many places as saints without papal authority, there is no record of papal disapproval of these cults except in the case of Sixtus IV, already mentioned, whose action was purely disciplinary, and who himself specifically approved of the conduct of the Ritual Murder case to which the matters referred . . .

"Those who condemn the Blood Accusation as a wicked invention for the purpose of persecuting Jews and robbing them, must at the same time condemn wholesale some of the highest dignitaries of the Catholic Church . . ." (A. S. Leese, *Jewish Ritual Murder.* Cited by I. B. Pranaitis in *The Talmud Unmasked,* App. II, 100)

Leo XIII, who was pontiff when the fierce tide of bourgeoisified anti-Semitism swept Germany, Austria, France, Russia and other countries, followed in the footsteps of his predecessors, but on a modern capitalist basis: *"Pope Leo XIII bestowed distinctions on Edouard Drumont, author of La France Juive, who accused the Jews of ritual*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

murder therein authority: Jewish Encyclopedia, 1905, Vol. X, 127" (100)

Pius X never condemned the Blood Accusation against the Jews in Limerick, Ireland, nor the pogrom which followed. "On January 11, 1904, Father Greagh, of the Redemptorist Order, delivered a violent sermon against the Jews, accusing them or ritual murder, of blaspheming Jesus, and of robbing the people of Limerick. On the following day there was a riot in which the Jews were attacked by mobs, and this was followed by a general boycott by the local Roman Catholic confraternity." *(Jewish Enc.* VIII, 89)

As we have indicated, the Jewish bourgeoisie, in line with its policy of cringing servility, tends to whitewash the popes with respect to the Christian infants sainted by the Church as martyrs of the Jewish ritual. Here is a sample of this deceptive whitewash: "It is noteworthy, however, that in barely any case did the alleged martyrdoms receive the official endorsement of the Catholic Church, always intensely objective even in its severity . . ." *(The Jews,* ed. L. Finkelstein, I, 225)

8. *"Sabbatosis" and "Foetentis Judaei"*

Since the effective use of the Jews as the chief social-political Scapegoat depended on building up the lie that they were in every way different from the rest of mankind, the Defamers invented diseases which, they said, were peculiar to the Jews alone. The first concoction of this sort dates back almost two thousand years: "Among his many charges, Apion claimed that the Jews derived the name Sabbath from the circumstance that they were obliged to rest after journeying for six days because they were afflicted with a painful disease which the Egyptians called Sabbatosis." *(Enc. Americana,* XVI, 99)

In line with the story that the Jew was physiologically different from other people was the invention that the body of the Jew supposedly exhuded a distinct and offensive odor: "Already in the days of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius, not a hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews are called *Foetentes Judaei,* as Ammianus Marcellinus, the Roman historian (flour. 320-95 C. E.), in his *History of Rome,* Book XXII, Ch. V. Secs. 4 and 5, testifies. This legend of the *foetor Judaices,* or evil smell of the Jews, afterwards so widely diffused in the Middle Ages, has its origin in this passage." (Kohut, *Victor Hugo and the Jews,* 7; *The American Hebrew,* March 14, 1902). ". . . in the Middle Ages it was widely believed that a Jew differed constitutionally from the remainder of the human race. His blood was supposed to be black and putrid, which was the cause of a disagreeable odor that distinguished him from the rest of mankind." (A. Cohen, *An Anglo-Jewish Scrapbook,* 322). "In 1262, a famous conference took place before the king and queen of Aragon,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

between the learned Rabbi Ezekiel and the very learned Dominican Brother Paul Ciriaque. When the Jewish Doctor had cited the Toldos Jeschut, the Targum, the Archives of Sanhedrin, the Nissachon Vetus, the Talmud, etc., the Queen concluded the dispute by asking why the Jews stank." (Victor Hugo, *Litterature et Philosophie Me'lees,* 10)

Basing their arguments upon the fabrication that the blood and the organism of the Jew were unique, the pseudo-scientists even in recent times, specifically in Tsarist Russia, stated that in the period of the Black Death the Jews spread the plague because they themselves were immune to it. (C. Vermel, *From the Pathology of the Jews,* R)

One would imagine that if the Jews were physically "different" this would constitute a serious obstacle to converting them to Christianity, for their bodies, logically, would undergo no transmutation. However, the Church got around this obstacle very neatly, for, as Sir Thomas Browne in book IV of *Pseudodoxia Epidemica* said, baptised Jews were purified, "as though aromatised by their conversion, they lost their scent with their religion, and smelt no longer that they savoured of the Jew." (Cited by A. Cohen, 323)

CHAPTER IV.

MARX'S AND ENGELS' ANTI-SEMITISM

1. *Marx's and Engels' Private Views on the Jewish Scapegoat*

MARX LEFT a record of his attitude toward the Jews as well as toward the Defamation. It can be found in his correspondence with Engels and in his public works. The intimate letters that passed between the two friends provide an insight into their real feelings on the matter. Marx, it must be recalled, was himself a Jew. "As soon as he began to come into contact with the Gentile world, and was intelligent enough to make comparisons, it was inevitable that he should feel his Jewish origin to be a disadvantage, a shackle upon his aspirations." (Otto Ruhle, *Karl Marx,* 12-13)

When Karl Marx was a child his father decided to convert to Christianity and he and his children were baptised as Lutherans. Within the orthodox Jewish community few acts of a member are considered as heinous and traitorous as baptism, especially if he accepts Christianity out of material considerations, as did the elder Marx. With the Jew adopting Christianity the feeling and detestation and repugnance is mutual. Instinctively the converted Jew strives to repudiate and wipe out the memory of his Jewish origin and is very susceptible to anti-Semitic infection.

For centuries the prefacing of the name of a person with the word *Jew* symbolized the gentiles' disdain towards the Jews. Marx, always pretending that he was a Gentile, a German, cynically fol-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lowed this custom: ". . . a colossal, purely swindling undertaking guided by the lumpen-proletarian Emperor and the Jew Fould." (Letter to Engels, Oct. 12, 1853). "The accursed Jew from Vienna also does not write." (Letter to Engels, May 25, 1859). "The Jew Wolfe" (Marx to Engels, May 10, 1861). "The Sheeny Horn" (Marx to Engels, Feb. 10, 1865). "The dirty Jew Bender." (Marx to Engels, Oct. 14, 1867). "Liebknecht has secured a good job from the Jew Oppenheim." (Marx to Engels, Jan. 29, 1853). "The author is a lousy Berlin correspondent of the Daily Telegraph, a Jew, one Mayer, a relative of a landlord from the City, also an English Jew named Levi." (Marx to Engels, Feb. 9, 1860). "Palmerston performed a trick; he introduced to the Queen mister Reuter (a Triest telegraph Jew)." (Marx to Engels, April 12, 1860). "I borrowed two pounds from the little Jew Bamberger." (Marx to Engels, June 29, 1853). About two years before, Bamberger had hesitated to discount Marx's note. Marx had been enraged; later he regreted he could not beat up the "little Jew" and his son: "I am terribly sorry that I could not have beaten up these two Jews for their scoundrelly delay, for the loss of time, for the fact that they placed me in a false position with respect to other people." (Letter to Engels, July 31, 1851. XXI, R. 228)

Engels, in his attitude towards the Jews, as in all other respects, was a true co-thinker of Marx: "Weill is too much of a Jew to be satisfied with banknotes for the first phalanstery of the future." (Letter to Marx, August 19, 1846). "I am impatiently awaiting Borkheim's 'pearl.' With respect to literary conceit the fellow is a real 'Jew.'" (Letter to Marx, Oct. 13, 1867)

In their exchanges about Lassalle, who was Jewish, Marx and Engels combined their aversion to a political rival with their detestation of the Jews. Engels wrote to Marx on March 7, 1856: "As a typical Jew from the Slavic border, he is always ready to exploit everyone for his private ends under party pretexts." (XXII, R. 128). In the same letter Engels further said: "This striving to elbow his way into distinguished circles, the desire, at least outwardly, to conceal with all sorts of cosmetics, rouge and make-up the dirty Jew from Breslau—has always been disgusting."

The Ancient originators of the anti-Jewish Defamation invented the tale that the Biblical Jews were a tribe of lepers. "Thus, Manetho, high priest of the temple at Heliopolis and court historian under the early Ptolemies, considered the Jews descendants of the Hyksos usurpers and attributed their expulsion from Egypt to sacrilege and irreligion, stigmatizing them at the same time as afflicted with leprosy—and the story was repeated by Chaeremon and Lysimachus, to reappear in Schiller's 'Mission of Moses.'" (*Enc. Amer.* XVI, 98)

It would be illogical to suppose that Marx ever believed the leprosy tale, for if he did he would have had to consider himself a descendant of lepers. But he used that ancient anti-Semitic fraud to express his contempt for Lassalle: "Lepsius has proved in his exten-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sive work on Egypt that the exodus of the Jews from Egypt was nothing but the story told by Manetho about the expulsion of 'a people of lepers' headed by an Egyptian priest named Moses. Leprous Lazarus, therefore, is the prototype of the Jew, and Lazarus is Lassalle. Only with our Lazarus leprosy has affected the brain. His disease originally represented a poorly-healed syphilis of the second period." (Letter to Engels, May 10, 1861. XXIII, R. 20)

During the American Civil War Lassalle visited Marx in London. Observing Lassalle's head and hair closely Marx arrived at the conclusion that his guest was not only a Jew but a Negro as well. "As the structure of his skull and also the variety of his hair proves, he is descended from the Negroes who joined the mob headed by Moses during its exodus from Egypt (unless his grandmother on the father's side or his mother committed a sin with a Negro.). Such a blend of Jewishness and Germanism with the Negro substance had to create an odd product. The insolence of this subject is also of the Negro variety." (Letter to Engels, July 30, 1862. *Ib.* 86)

These anti-Semitic and white-chauvinist phrases came from a professed enemy of all race and national prejudices. Devoted, in public, to the cause of the oppressed, not the least among whom were the Jewish and the Negro masses, Marx, with Aryan race superiority, secretly engaged in an exchange of anti-Semitic and white-chauvinist sentiments with Engels. In the same letter Marx added: "Fortunately, the Jewish nigger, Lassalle [der Judische Nigger Lassalle], is leaving next week."

2. *What Marx and Engels Concealed About Their Teachers*

"—We German Socialists are proud of the fact that we are derived not only from Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen, but also from Kant, Fichte and Hegel." (Engels, Preface to *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific,* 1882). The first three mentioned by Engels were the so-called Utopian Socialists; the others were famous German philosophers. Let us examine the position some of these people held toward the Jewish Scapegoat.

Kant's attitude was of such nature that it was utilized by Black Hundred writers. Shmakov cited the following from Kant: " 'The Palestinians who live among us have attracted attention to themselves by their spirit of usury and reputation as crooks, well founded in an overwhelming majority of cases. Strictly speaking, it would appear nonsensical to imagine a whole nation in which every man is a thief. Yet it is strange to see such a people which consists exclusively of peddlers who hold in contempt the honor of being good citizens of the country which gave them asylum and instead prefer profits which they acquire by means of cheating the inhabitants of this very country.' " (*Evreiskie Rechi,* 89). The tone of Kant's utterance is clear

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

enough for one to judge just how deeply rooted in his philosophy anti-Semitism was. No less anti-Semitic was Fichte:

" 'Over nearly all countries of Europe hovers a mighty hostile State which engages in an uninterrupted war against the rest of the powers and terribly oppresses their citizens—this is Judaism . . . it is based and developed on a profound hatred of the entire human race . . . I wish to say that in a State where even the most absolutist monarch will not deprive me without cause of the hovel of my ancestors the first passing Jew should not be permitted to rob me with impunity every time he so desires.

"And these people wish to have the *rights of man,* even though *they themselves deny these rights to us* (as is seen from the Talmud). To grant citizen rights to the Jews would be possible only under one condition: that one beautiful night each Jewish head be replaced with another in which there should not remain a single Jewish idea." *(Berichte zur Berichtigung der Urtheile uber die franzosische Revolution,* 186-191. Cited by Shmakov in *Evreiskie Rechi,* 87)

We shall take up the "Utopian Socialists," as they were misnamed by both Liberals and Marxists. Owen's outlook on the question was completely clouded by abstract humanitarianism. He failed to distinguish anything singular in the persecution of the Jews: "Is there today a particle of common sense in the conduct of the Jews, Chinese, Mahommedans, Buddists, Christians, etc. towards each other, or in their thoughts or feelings?" *(Robert Owen's Journal,* Aug. 7, 1852, 118). As far as we have been able to ascertain, Owen was markedly affected by the calumniation, hate and persecution directed against the Jews, but considered these evils as part of the "senseless" phenomena. Marx and Engels derived from Owen neither his fantastic confusion, nor his honesty, nor his apparently sympathetic sentiment toward the most persecuted "national" group in the evolution of mankind.

Of all the Utopian Socialists, Fourier was held in special esteem as a critic of capitalist conditions by Marx and Engels and their burocratic followers. "In Fourier we find a critique of existing social conditions, which, typically French in its wit, is none the less penetrating." (Engels, "Socialism: Utopian and Scientific," *S. W.* I, 149). Since the case of the Jewish Scapegoat was very much a part of the existing social conditions, let us examine the views Fourier advanced regarding the Jews: "Ah! Has there ever been a nation more despicable than the Hebrews, who have achieved nothing in art and science, and who are distinguished only by a record of crime and brutality which at every page of their loathsome annals makes you sick!" (Fourier, *Theorie des quatre mouvements,* 61. Cited in *Jewish Social Studies,* VIII, # 4, Oct. 1946, 249). That's how "penetrating" Fourier's "critique of existing conditions" was!

Burning with hatred against the Jews, Fourier, the so-called Utopian Socialist, echoed the most atrocious accusations levelled at

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

them: "The Jew is, so to speak, a traitor by definition." *(Publication des manuscripts* II, 226. Cited in J. S. S. Oct. 1946, 248). It was not by accident that Fourier found no fault in Napoleon's persecution of the Jews. The Dictator had been portrayed by him not as a militarist and usurper but as a savior of the masses, a builder of peace. Fourier addressed the French masses: "People! Your premonitions will be realized, the most brilliant mission has been given to the greatest of all heroes. He must create universal harmony on the ruins of barbarism and civilization." (Cited by Dvortsov of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR Institute of Philosophy, in *Charles Fourier, His Life and Teachings,* R. 46)

Fourier spewed his venom against the Jews in almost every one of his major works. The Jews, vituperated the great "Utopian Socialist," were spies, informers, hangmen, traitors, not only in France but in all other countries. "The Jews by virtue of their dedication to trade, are the spies of all nations and if need be, informers and hangmen." *(Theorie de l'unite universelle,* IV, 424; cited in *J. S. S.* Oct. 1946). No wonder the professional anti-Semites named Fourier as the forefather of modern anti-Semitism. *(Deutsche Zeitung,* March 13, 1920). "Louis Ferdinand Celine, author of several pornographic books attacking the Jews with a viciousness that surpasses even Streicher's, was in a position to use as mottoes for the chapters of his books excerpts from the writings of great pioneers of French Socialism, Fourier . . ." *(Jewish Social Studies,* Jan. 1947, 60)

Fourier's concern for the future of the French bourgeoisie, not of the masses, can be easily gleaned from his anti-Semitic utterances: "Leave the Jews in France for a century and they will organize their sect in each town; they will cooperate only among themselves. They will become in France what they are in Poland and will eventually snatch commercial vocations from citizens who thus far have carried on smoothly without Jews. That is what is happening in Germany, where honest businessmen have to give up their businesses because they are unable to withstand the competition of the Jews." *(Publication des manuscripts,* III, 36; *J. S. S.* Oct. 1946)

Marx and Engels were fascinated by Fourier very early in their political career. On March 7, 1845 Engels wrote to Marx: "We are getting ready to translate Fourier and if possible to put out a 'Library of outstanding foreign socialists.' The best thing, to begin with Fourier." (XXI, R. 16)

Engels chided the German intellectuals and radical students for failing to recognize in Fourier a great teacher and an astute critic of capitalist relations. "I want to read to these wise gentlemen a small chapter from Fourier which may serve them as a sample." (V. R. 46). And Engels gave them an extract from Fourier, a story of "Judas Iscariot," a hypothetical Jewish merchant who unscrupulously competed with "honest" French business men, ruined them and acquired riches through a "Jewish" method of amassing wealth:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Judas Iscariot arrives in France with a capital of 100,000 francs which he gained out of his first bankruptcy. He settles down in some city where he competes with six respectable houses which are enjoying credit. In order to deprive them of their clients and their good name Iscariot starts out by selling goods at cost—a sure means of attracting the masses. Soon his competitors begin to curse him aloud in every way, but he pays no attention whatsoever and continues selling at cost.

"The people are enthusiastic: long live competition, long live the Jews, long live philosophy and brotherhood. All commodities fell in price with the appearance of Iscariot and the public declares to his competitors: 'Dear sirs, it is you who are the real Jews, you want to make big profits; the only honest man here is Iscariot, he is satisfied with a modest income because he does not parade around with so much glitter as you do.' All the assurances by the old houses that Iscariot is a disguised crook and that sooner or later he will go bankrupt are of no avail. The public accuses them of jealousy and calumny, and more and more patronizes the sons of Israel. The calculations of the robber are as follows: by selling at cost he loses only the interest on his capital, say 10,000 francs a year, but with all that he creates for himself in the ports a name as a great consumer and, with short-term payments, establishes a large credit. Such trickery is carried out for two years during which Iscariot makes no profit although he has sold a great amount of goods. His machinations remain secret because the Jews employ only Jewish office men, people who are secret enemies of all nations and, naturally, will not reveal even a single swindle of one of their own.

"When the situation has matured, Iscariot makes use of all his credit, issues tremendous orders in all ports, buys up goods on terms for five to six hundred thousand francs. He ships his goods abroad and all the goods in his warehouse he sells virtually for nothing. When everything is converted into money the brave Iscariot disappears with his portfolio and returns to Germany whither he has shipped the goods he bought on terms, rapidly sells them and finds himself at the time he leaves France four times richer than when he entered it. He has 400,000 francs and he departs for London or Livorno in order to start his spider web for the third bankruptcy.

"At this point the curtain falls and in the city where he carried out his experiment people recover their senses. They realize how dangerous it is to permit the Jews to enter the commercial field, tramps who have no foundation under them. But Iscariot's bankruptcy is only the first act of the farce. Let us follow up the running fire. Iscariot had six competitors: we will call them A, B, C, D, E, F. 'A' was already for a long time in difficult circumstances but hung on somehow without resources thanks to his good name. However, having lost, with the arrival of Iscariot, all his customers, he could hold out only for one year, and, not having grasped the new philosophical

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

system which gives protection to tramps, 'A' realizes he is compelled to bow to Iscariot's tactics and *declare himself bankrupt.*

" 'B' was able to withstand the blow longer. He from the outset, understood the swindling essence of Iscariot and waited until the storm subsided in order to restore his clientele which was captured by Iscariot. But by then he is caught in a foreign bankruptcy. This is sufficient to hasten his crash. He hoped to hold out for two years, but on the fifteenth month he is compelled to declare bankruptcy.

" 'C' was a partner in a foreign firm which was ruined by another Iscariot—they exist in every city. . . . Thus, it is sufficient for some tramp or a Jew to appear in order to disorganize the entire commerce of a large city and involve the most honest people in crime —for every bankruptcy is more or less a crime, no matter how it be defended with most cogent arguments like those with which I have described the six bankruptcies . . ." (V. R. 72-75)

Having given this supposedly educational example of "criticsim" of capitalist relations, Engels authoritatively exclaimed: "Had our German half-Communist and Communist scholars gone to the trouble of getting acquainted a little with the main works of Fourier, which they can obtain just as easily as any German book, what a rich source of material they would have obtained for constructive work and for other requirements!" (87). Fourier's material for "constructive work" which Marx and Engels offered to the German Communist students also contained a plan for a merciless drive against the Jews as an aid to the native bourgeoisie in the commercial field:

"One should, therefore, apply strict measures to the Jews." *(Publication des manuscripts,* II, 228)

3. *Social Democracy and the Bolsheviks in the Footsteps of Marx and Engels on Fourier*

In order to shield Marx and Engels, the entire Marxist leadership has been careful not to brand Fourier as an avowed anti-Semite. Social Democracy has venerated Fourier's works. A founder of German Social Democracy wrote: "His works are remarkable for their astounding plethora of original ideas and views which to a considerable extent are very fruitful both for the present period and for the future development of mankind . . . in the future it only remains to continue further along the path he charted and to consistently develop his basic propositions." (A. Bebel, *Charles Fourier, His Life and Teaching,* R. 203; cited by Dvortsov, 19)

Before Lenin and Trotsky took power they had hardly ever mentioned Fourier, but the moment they established their burocratic dictatorship they began to spread the Fourierist "teachings" among the Russian workers: "Selected Works of Fourier were issued in Russian in 1918 under the editorship of Totomiants." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LIX, 349). Engels' article "Fourier on Commerce" containing the "Judas Iscariot" story was printed in the April 1922 issue of *Under the Banner*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Marxism (R. 23). The principal dissemination of Fourier's anti-Semitic "teachings" in the Bolshevik State took place under Stalin. The hundredth anniversary of Fourier's death was commemorated by Stalin with the printing of the *Theories des quatre mouvements,* which contains Fourier's violent fulmination "Ah! Has there ever been a nation more despicable than the Hebrews," and *Le Nouveau Monde,* in which Fourier condemned the granting of citizen rights to the Jews. Dvortsov, a Russian Marxist assigned by the Stalin burocracy to stimulate an interest in Fourier's "teachings" among the students and advanced workers in the Bolshevik State, said: "Our circle of people who are really familiar with the world-outlook and teachings of Charles Fourier is very limited. . . . Moreover, his basic writings, which represent a theoretical as well as practical interest in the hundred years since Fourier's death, never appeared in the Russian language. Only now, in connection with the hundredth anniversary of the death of the utopian-Socialist has it been proposed in 1938 to issue two volumes of his selected works, *Theorie des quatre mouvements ou les destinees generales* and *Le Nouveau Monde industrial et societaire.*" (6)

Dvortsov carried out his assignment with consummate skill: "Charles Fourier went down in history as a remarkable, most clever critic of Capitalism and the harbinger of a new, happy life of mankind. Marx and Engels regarded Fourier as one of the patriarchs of Socialism . . . It is necessary to say there were not a few efforts to blacken and debase the highly upright essence of the French utopian-Socialist both in the West as well as in Tsarist Russia. And if the critics of Fourier's 'craziness' failed in their scheme then the credit for that is due, in the first place, to Marx, Engels and Lenin who gave exhaustive instructions and high appraisal of the ideological heritage of the great utopian-Socialists." (5). With these words Stalin's henchman warned that anyone attempting to contradict the auhoritative line on Fourier as laid down by the "founders of scientific Socialism" would find himself in disfavor and in one of Stalin's Lubiankas.

Dvortsov further wrote: "And today, with the elapse of a hundred years since the death of Charles Fourier, there is something to find in this great patriarch of Socialism, there is something to learn from him . . . The name of Charles Fourier will pass from mouth to mouth for more than one century." (179). And to make Fourier's anti-Semitic works a prescribed ideology for the proletariat, Dvortsov linked the name of Fourier with that of the Bolshevik Dictator: "On the hundredth anniversary of Fourier's death, when, in place of the highly gifted fantasies and touching dreams about a harmonious, happy future of humanity, there has been erected in our country the granite edifice of Socialism, when the daring day-dreams of the best minds of humanity have been transformed by the efforts and struggle of the toilers, with their beloved leader Comrade Stalin at the head, into a beautiful, happy reality, we pay our respects to the champion of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the new social relations—Charles Fourier." (22). The "new" social relations which Fourier championed and wished to realize in France were, as we have seen: Take measures against the Jews! Hound the Jews! Protect French business against these Judas Iscariots!

Fourier was a watchdog of the interests of the native French bourgeoisie. He saw the danger to Capitalism from the growing proletariat and was spinning alluring pictures of "socialist phalansteries" in which all men would cooperate as brothers. If Fourier had let it go at that, one could classify him with Owen as a utopian dreamer, a subjectively honest social reformer. But Fourier's Bonapartist, and even more significant, anti-Semitic views and policy give his secret away. His cry that the Jew was a traitor, that the Jew was a spy, that the Jew was a threat to the native merchants was the old familiar cry of the defenders of the interests of the ruling classes and groups for many centuries. The man whom Bebel lauded and whom the Stalinists called "the harbinger of a new, happy life of mankind" condemned the French Revolution for granting citizenship status to the Jews: "To these above-mentioned crimes, all crimes of circumstance, we must add the most hideous, the admission of the Jews to the right of citizenship." *(Le Nouveau Monde Industriel,* II, 304)

Such was the "great patriarch of Socialism," Charles Fourier!

4. *The "Young Hegelians"—Anti-Semitic Philosophers*

Following Hegel's death his disciples split; some of them adopted, with modification, his refined Christian religion and his frank German patriotism, others veered sharply to the Left, putting materialist fibre into their "Hegelianism" akin to the anti-Church ideology of the French Revolution. The adherents of this "radical" wing styled themselves "Young Hegelians" or "The Free." Their leading figure was Bruno Bauer, of Jewish origin. Marx and Engels were the youngest of the Young Hegelians.

One of the most sensational works that came from the Young Hegelian extreme Left "revolutionists" was Bauer's *Die Judenfrage,* written in line with their philosophical "belief" in mankind: "At the time when the Jews of Germany strove hard to obtain their long-witheld political freedom and equality, and when many, in order to assert their full claim to citizenship, went so far as to urge the rejection of every vestige of Orientalism from their religious life, Bauer published an article in the 'Deutsche Jahrbucher,' 1842, on the Jewish question, afterward republished with additions, as a separate book under the title 'Die Judenfrage,' Brunswick, 1843, in which he sides with the bitterest enemies of the Jews." *(Jewish Enc.* II, 599-600). "In the present instance the attack on the Jews was launched by a representative of extreme radicalism." *(Ev. Enc.* III, 609)

Bauer resorted to sophistry to reject the idea of terminating the oppression of the Jews: "Upon what title do you Jews ground your

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

claim for emancipation? On your religion? It is the mortal foe of the State religion. As citizens? In Germany there are no citizens. As human beings? You are not human beings, any more than those to whom you are appealing." (Cited by Ruhle, 63). Bauer's attack upon the Jewish Scapegoat came in the wake of the world-wide anti-Jewish excitement caused by the Damascus frame-up.

Standing on the extreme Left in the bourgeois scale, Bauer sided with the extreme Right in relation to the Jews. Marx was only 25 then, but despite his youth he possessed an encyclopedic knowledge. Shortly after Bauer's attack on the Jews, Marx invited this avowed literary persecutor of the Jews to collaborate on a magazine, the *Deutsch-Franzoisische Jahrbucher,* (1843) and the only reason the collaboration did not materialize was because "he had ignored the invitation." (Ruhle, 78)

In the magazine Marx published, among other things, his disagreements with Bauer on the "Jewish Question." The "differences" were entirely within the anti-Semitic confines. Marx did not describe the Jewish group as the classical Scapegoat of the Ancient, Feudal and Capitalist systems but as an "anti-Social element" of his day. Bourgeois circles were discussing the issue of "emancipating" the Jews but Marx raised a different issue—not of overthrowing the existing system of royalist-bourgeois oppression—but of *freeing mankind from Jewry!*

"And thus, we recognize in the Jewry a general *anti-social element of contemporary times,* which has come to its present highest point by historical development and, in a bad sense, cooperation of the Jews, a point at which it must of necessity disintegrate. The emancipation of the Jews in its final meaning is the emancipation of mankind from Jewry.

"The Jew has already emancipated himself in a Jewish way. 'A Jew who, for example, in Vienna is only tolerated, determines the fate of the entire Empire through his money bag. The Jew who may be without rights in the smallest German States decides the fate of Europe.

" 'At the time when corporations and trades are closed to the Jew or dislike him, the courage of commerce mocks at the stubbornness of the medieval institutions.' (B. Bauer, Jewish Question p. 14)." [*Note:* the foregoing is a quotation from Bauer cited with approval by Marx—G. S.]

Marx continues in reference to Bauer's remarks:

"And this is not an isolated fact. The Jew has emancipated himself in the Jewish way not only by arrogating to himself the money power but also by virtue of the fact that through him and without him *money* has become a world power, and the practical spirit of Christian nations." (I, R. 394)

While Bauer centered his attack on the religious, or the "Sabbath" Jews, Marx dealt with all the Jews:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Let us consider the real worldly Jews, not the Sabbath Jews, as Bauer does, but the every-day Jews. We will not look for the secret of the Jew in his religion, but we will look for the secret of religion in the real Jew. What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical needs, egoism. What is the secular cult of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his secular God? Money." (I, R., 393; *Sel. Essays,* 88)

Preceding the Nazi torture and almost total extermination of the Jews of Germany, Poland and many other countries, Hitler's ideologists dug up Marx's anti-Semitic poison to arouse the masses against the Jews. "Carl Marx, who was himself of Jewish origin, admitted that 'money is the real secular deity of Jewdom.'" (Roderich-Stoltheim, *The Riddle of the Jew's Success,* 217). Other specialists in hounding the Jews have "disagreed" with Marx, but the "disagreement," as in the case of the Marx-Bauer controversy, is within the anti-Semitic orbit. "Marx wants us to think that *greed alone* is the religion of the Jews. No! Christ warned, and the history of the Talmud confirmed, that the chief 'lust' of the Jews is 'destruction of humankind' hatred of mankind in every sense." (Cherep-Spiridovich, Society 'Save Russia,' *Excerpts From the Talmud)*

Marx's anti-Semitism was part of the widespread barrage of Defamation against the Jews carried on from one end of Europe to the other. Just then, for example, a portion of the British press violently assailed the Jews and precisely along the same "money" line. The *Morning Post* declared: "The Jews have been, from time immemorial, incarnations of the principle of *usury;* and wherever the principle of usury has been allowed scope, the right of productive industry has been invariably trampled under foot. Let the history of modern Europe be carefully examined, and it will be found that in direct proportion to the growing influence of the Jews, has been the abasement of the great mass of the labouring classes. Wherever the Jews flourish most, there will be found to flourish, in the rankest luxuriance, the arts of usury, of money-jobbing, and extortion." (Cited in *The Occident,* April 1844, 48)

Marx poured out almost identical anti-Semitic poison: "Money is the jealous God of Israel, by the side of which no other god may exist. Money degrades all the gods of man and converts them into commodities. Money is the general and self-constituted value of all things. Consequently it has robbed the whole world—the world of mankind as well as nature—of its precious value. Money is the being of Man's work and existence alienated from himself, and this alien being rules him, and he prays to it.

"The God of the Jews has secularized himself and became the universal God. Exchange is the Jew's real God." (I, R. 396; *Sel. Essays,* 92-3)

It will be noted that while criminally attacking the Jewish Scapegoat, Marx committed an outrage against the science of political economy by stooping to the *anti-Jewish* interpretation of money.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Jews, or, to speak correctly, the Jewish bourgeoisie was not governed by the passion for money but for *gain;* however, this passion of acquisitiveness was common to the German, French, British, Italian, and all the other national sections of the capitalist class. Even if Marx had said the entire bourgeoisie worshiped money it would have been incorrect. The bourgeoisie worshiped *gain.* It was not money that degraded all things but exploitation and oppression.

The source of bourgeois wealth lies not in the accumulation of money, and not in the exchange of commodities but in the mode of production, the exploitation of the proletariat. And the mode of production at any stage of the evolution of society has certain *class,* not national or religious characteristics. Later, in *Capital,* Marx stated: "The character of the circulation rather depends on that of production. It is, however, quite characteristic of the bourgeois horizon, which is entirely bounded by the craze for making money, not to see in the character of the mode of production the basis of the corresponding mode of circulation, but vice versa." (II, 132-3). In his article *On the Jewish Question,* however, Marx not only presented the money aspect of capitalist economy from "the bourgeois horizon" but from the anti-Semitic angle of this horizon at that. Marx's "money-Jews" treatment of the problem was no innovation: he definitely borrowed it from the centuries' old Defamation. Eleven years after he wrote the essay a Jewish bourgeois magazine in New York complained: "Since the Dispersion, it has been charged as a crime that the Israelites are a Mammon-loving people. Century after century men have labored to prove that the charge was false. That the Hebrew was necessitated in his course of action, and restricted to few channels for the employment of the energies with which his Creator has endowed him. These laborers have never succeeded in extirpating the belief. A Jew and his money bags have rarely been separated in the mind of his Christian neighbor." *(Asmonean,* May 25, 1855)

Let us glance at the condition of the Jewish Scapegoat in the period when Marx came out in the open with his anti-Semitism. There were Jewish pogroms in various sectors of Europe. A pogrom took place in Gesecke, Westphalia *(Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung,* May 12, 1844). Pogroms occurred in Hungary. There was a mass attack on the Jews of Prague: "Some days ago the public papers announced that 2,000 Israelites have left Prague, in consequence of the aggression of the populace, to which they had been subjected." *(Archives Israelites,* August 1844; cited by W. Ayerst in *The Jews of the Nineteenth Century,* 376). A new attempt to accuse the Jews of using human blood was made at Damascus. There was a Blood Accusation in Cairo. *(Morning Herald,* Oct. 1844). The Jews of Austrian Poland lived in a pogrom atmosphere due to Blood Accusations: "1844. On 17 of April, the Jews of Tarnow addressed a petition to the Emperor Ferdinand of Austria, that he would oppose the blood-accusation

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which was continually being levelled against the Jews in Galicia." (H. Strack, *The Jew and Human Sacrifice,* 209)

The year 1845 marked a new rise in the output of Defamation literature. A Young Hegelian, Moses Hess, nicknamed the "Communist Rabbi" because he was a "utopian Communist" and a Jew, wrote an article "On the Monetary System." Closely adhering to the views aired by Marx, whom he idolized for some time, Hess said of the Jews that "in the natural history of the social animals they had the world-historical function to develop the beast of prey out of humanity." (Cited in *Jewish Soc. St.,* April 1945, 141). Another Jewish Hegelian anti-Semite was Ferdinand Lassalle. In his youth he was full of fighting dreams to liberate the Jews: "I would risk my life to free the Jews from the oppression which now burdens them . . . Later he came to despise Jews . . ." (A. L. Sachar, *Opinion,* Jan. 1935, 13). When Lassalle became an ardent German Nationalist and labor "guide" he showed his anti-Semitic colors: "The workers' movement has to be freed from capitalists and Jews." (Cited by A. Grimpen, *Judentum und Sozialdemokratie,* title page)

Heinrich Heine, a Jewish German poet, who would sit at the feet of Hegel, reversed the expression of the Defamers, I hate the Jewry although some of my best friends are Jews, and, instead, declared: "I love the Jewry and I hate the individual Jew." (Cited by Shmakov in *Ev. Rechi,* 177). Rabbi M. Liber in a work *Judaism et Socialisme; Henri Heine, Karl Marx et Le Judaisme* records some of Heine's attacks on the Jews:

"Here are a few quotations. 'The Jews here (at Lunebourg, 1823) as everywhere are miserly and disgusting traffickers' (Letters to Moser). 'I am convinced that an Israelite has never given money unless his teeth were forcefully extracted as in the time of the Valois . . . vanity has been known to open the pockets of the Jews; but then their generosity was more repelling than their avarice!' (Letters from Paris)." *(La Revue de Paris,* 1928, 616-617)

A very powerful Left bourgeois assault on the Jewish Scapegoat was made by a French Fourierist, Toussenel. The Stalin historians readily recognized him as an anti-Semite and pointed out the unique pattern he employed in turning the attention of the proletariat away from capitalist oppression: "The Anti-Semite Toussenel in 1845 sought to prove that the root of the evil was not private property but the 'Zhid spirit' that gripped Europe. This was an attempt to divert the masses from the Socialist and revolutionary agitators of the Forties." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.,* III, 70)

Toussenel was not the only anti-Semitic writer using the lie that bourgeois society was pervaded with a Jewish spirit. There were others in the same year, 1845: "It has been proved that the task of abolishing Jewry is really the task of abolishing the *Jewish spirit of bourgeois society,* the inhumanity of modern living practice, the culminating point of which is the money system." The names of the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Left anti-Semites who thus repeated Toussenel's charlatanry about the Jewish spirit were Marx and Engels. ("The Holy Family," III, R. 137)

There never was such a thing as a "Jewish spirit" of society—whether in the Ancient World, whether under Feudalism or Capitalism. What did exist for over two thousand years was the *anti-Jewish* spirit of society, and Marx and Engels were part of this spirit.

CHAPTER V.

MARX AND ENGELS INCITE TO ANTI-JEWISH POGROMS IN POSEN

1. *Support to the Hungarian Pogrom Regime*

WHEN THE social and political storm of 1848 broke over Europe, many ideas, including those bolstering the anti-Jewish spirit of bourgeois society, found immediate application. Pogrom agents of the autocracy made attempts to divert the revolutionary fury of the masses into anti-Jewish channels. In towns of the Upper and Lower Rhine mobs spewing hatred against the Jews staged a series of pogroms. (Brumath, Altkirch, Durmenach, Hagenthal Hagenhem, Uber Dorf, Seppois and other places—*Archives Israelites,* 1848, 185-6, 187, 214, 227-30, 257, 259). In Bavaria the pogromists attacked the Jews with the cry: "You want freedom, government jobs? Death—that's what you deserve!" (Cited by Dubnov in *Newest History of the Jewish People,* R. I. 276)

The key factor in the freedom of action the pogromists enjoyed was the connivance of the authorities. This was best illustrated in the case of Alsace where the policy of using the Jewish Scapegoat backfired against the Gentile bourgeoisie. When that happened the authorities acted to liquidate the pogrom situation: "During the pogroms in Alsace (1848), after having settled their accounts with the Jews, the hoodlums started spreading a hoax that the rich gentiles were merely Jews in disguise; it was only then that the authorities took steps to suppress the riots." *(Jewish Social Studies,* IX, 1947, 57)

We have seen that in the period preceding the Revolution of 1848 anti-Jewish sentiment simmered even in the Leftmost circles of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The first 1848 casualty of the bourgeois democrats in power was the Jewish population of Hungary. The Hungarian bourgeois revolution was led by Louis Kossuth who on the day after the overthrow of the Metternich regime promulgated the Jewish "emancipation." However, the hypocrisy of Kossuth and his colleagues was soon revealed: "The events themselves were met by the Jews with great enthusiasm; from these events they expected

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the issuance of a declaration of emancipation. And indeed on March 14 the Diet unanimously decided that the Jews, like the rest of the citizens, were to enjoy the active and passive electoral rights. On the same day in Pest a grandiose meeting took place presenting in the name of the Hungarian people a number of demands including equality of the Jews with the Magyars; a Jew, Rosenfeld, won great sympathy by his speech at the gathering. 'All patriots without religious distinction were allowed into the National Guard, and three Jews, Kirsvalder, Keleti and Yust were elected to the capital's Committee of Public Safety. Soon, however, on the ground that the Jews supposedly utilized the fruits of victory exclusively in their own interests, there began a sharp anti-Jewish agitation and the Diet annulled the decision to grant the Jews electoral rights and inserted a trick-clause into the electoral law about persons belonging to the religions recognized by the State, as if giving moral sanction to the anti-Semitic agitation." *(Ev. Enc.* V, 444-5)

A few days after the victory over the Austrian autocracy the Hungarian bourgeoisie staged a Kishenev: "On the 19 and 20 of March 1848 the streets of Pressburg were in the hands of wild bands composed of petty bourgeoisie and loomps. The pogromists smashed the houses and shops of the Jews . . . The police and regular troops did nothing to stop the violence . . . The Diet delegates nonchalantly looked on at the horrors. Kossuth diplomatically declared that 'the interference of the Government (to stop the pogromists) would have caused a massacre of the Jews.'" (Dubnov, *Newest History of the Jewish People,* R. II, 324)

Some details of the attack on the Pressburg Jews reached across the Atlantic: *"Persecution of the Jews in Hungary.* Several fugitive Jews arrived at Vienna on the 22 ult. from Pressburg. They announced a most fearful persecution against the Jews, which broke out there, and which, if only a portion of the details be true, remind us of the middle ages." *(N. Y. Tribune,* April 24, 1848)

But Pressburg was only the beginning of the anti-Jewish policy of the Kossuth "democracy." For two months the pogrom tide swept bourgeois-revolutionary Hungary: "The triumph of the Pressburg pogromists encouraged the Jew-haters of other towns to carry out similar acts . . . The pogrom tide reached Pest, the seat of the Goverenment, where the Jews still held their head high, serving in the National Guard and participating in the liberation of the 'fatherland.' This was after the closing of the Pressburg Diet (April 11) when all the affairs were conducted by the Kossuth-Batthyany regime. On the 19th of April . . . a crowd of Magyar 'patriots' gathered in front of the magistrate's building and presented demands that the Jews who had settled in Pest after 1840 be driven out and the Jewish youth be expelled from the National Guard . . . Batthyany issued a deceptive proclamation in which he said that although the government had no right to annul the law which obligated every 'son

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the fatherland' to serve in citizens' militia, nevertheless, 'yielding to the request of the Jewish representatives' it found it necessary to order a 'temporary disarming of the Jews serving in the Hungarian National Guard.' The Jews of Pressburg were subjected to a similar expulsion from the National Guard.

"That's how the feeling of three-hundred thousand people was brutally mocked in a country whose slogan of liberation was 'All for the Magyars, nothing for the other peoples of Hungary!' " (S. Dubnov, *N. H. J. P.* R., II, 324-5)

The narrow Kossuth Constitution deprived the Magyar workers and poor peasants and even a section of the impoverished urban petty-bourgeoisie of political suffrage by limiting the franchise only to males possessing property to the value of $150. By attacking the traditional social Scapegoat the Magyar bourgeoisie and aristocracy, in the normal way of oppressors, sought to fortify their privileged economic, political and social station both against the Magyar masses and against all other nationalities in Hungary. This policy produced a rebellious sentiment among the Slav groups. "Croats, Vlachs, Serbs and Slovaks resented Magyar domination—a domination which had been carefully secured under the revolutionary constitution by a very narrow franchise." *(Enc. Brit.,* XIII, 916)

The Jews, in their unending quest for tolerance, followed the traditional policy of choosing the "lesser" of two evils. They had known the indignities, the ghetto internment under the Austrian despotism; now they heard the Kossuth regime promising liberty, equality and constitutionalism. Overlooking the cruel treatment the Jews appealed to the patently anti-Semitic and undemocratic rulers to be just and democratic: "On the 24 of July in the name of the Jews of the kingdom and its territories an address was submitted in which it was asked that the Diet execute 'justice that knows of no half-measures and privileges.' 'Be just' it said in conclusion 'and you will be victorious. The great cause for which you are destined to struggle will be able to win to its side 400,000 inspired people ready for any sacrifice.' The Diet, however, did not consider it 'timely' to start reviewing the Jewish question and transferred it to a special commission the majority of which was opposed to emancipation." *(Ev. Enc.* V, 446)

The Jewish masses, responding to the summons of the Jewish bourgeoisie, offered their lives in the interests of the Magyar ruling classes and fought to suppress the Croats and to repel the Austrians. Yet while the Hungarian Army inflicted one humiliating defeat after another on the Austrian troops, Kossuth left the question of social and political "equality" for the Jews completely out of the Diet's deliberations. Then the Tsar entered the scene. A large Russian Army under Prince Paskevich came to the aid of the Austrian general Haynau. Their combined forces were 375,000 men as against 160,000 at Kossuth's disposal. The tables turned rapidly and decisively. Kos-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

suth's government abandoned Pest on July 2, 1849; the Austro-Russian victories began to dispel his grandiose dream of making the puny Magyar bourgeoisie a great European power. Then, on July 28, about two weeks before the final catastrophe, Premier Szemere delivered an impassioned appeal in the Hungarian Diet for justice to the Jews. " 'The fatherland' he said 'must expiate a terrible crime against its children of Jewish origin, and I don't know how compensation can be given those who in reply to many centuries long oppression, persecution and mockery subject their lives to great dangers for the cause of their oppressors . . . Let there be at least, as some measure of expression of our appreciation, a unanimous declaration of the Diet that from now on these heroes have a fatherland bought at such a great cost that they are our brothers of equal rights, real Hungarians who did for Hungary more than any other nation.' To the loud cries 'Eljen, helyes' (bravo, it is just) the emancipation of the Jews was proclaimed unanimously . . . This law was not put into effect because several days later the Hungarian Army capitulated at Vilagos and Haynau occupied the whole country." (V, 447)

This paper act of "justice" to the Jews by their "democratic" Hungarian oppressors was a political measure designed for future contingencies. Though facing defeat, the Hungarian bourgeoisie never abandoned hope for independence, and this measure would make the Jews grateful in memory and loyal to the Magyar ruling class. Meanwhile the Jews suffered doubly for the Hungarian defeat. The Austrians inflicted upon the Jewish Scapegoat a greater punishment than upon the Magyars. "The reprisals of the Austrian general Haynau fell heaviest upon the Jews. Jews were arrested and executed, others had to emigrate . . ." *(Univ. J. Enc.* V, 494)

We shall now scrutinize the position adopted by Marx toward Hungary. He aimed, we recall, to unite all German States into one powerful bourgeois State which would be preeminent in Europe through a shattering military triumph over Russia. Bourgeois-revolutionary Hungary, in conflict with the pro-Tsarist Austrian autocracy which constituted one of the great obstacles to Marx's program, was therefore a "natural ally," more accurately, was a potential satellite of Germany. Writing in the New York *Tribune* of April 9, 1852, some years after the events, Marx stated: "We are known to harbour no unfriendly feeling toward Hungary. We stood by her during the struggle; we may be allowed to say that our paper, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* has done more than any other to render the Hungarian cause popular in Germany, by explaining the nature of the struggle between the Magyar and Slavonian races . . . We even now in any future continental convulsion, consider Hungary as the necessary and natural ally of Germany." ("Germany: Rev. and Count. Rev." *S. W.* II, 110-11)

What Marx thought *privately* about *"Revolutionary"* Hungary in 1848 is recorded in his correspondence: ". . . the Hungarian trash

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

(this bee-hive of nationalities)." (Letter to Engels, Nov. 29, 1848. XXI, R. 104)

In a controversy with Bakunin over the status of Slovenes and Croats, Marx employed a sleight of hand and converted the four million Magyars into one of the big nations, placing Hungary on a par with Germany in importance. Marx demanded access to the Adriatic Sea for "big" Hungary and her "ally" Germany:

"Slovenes and Croats are cutting off Germany and Hungary from the Adriatic, but Germany and Hungary cannot allow being cut off from the Adriatic out of 'geographical and commercial considerations,' which it is true, do not constitute an obstacle to the fantasy of Bakunin, but which, nevertheless exist and represent for Germany and Hungary the same vital question as, for instance, the Baltic coast from Danzig to Riga does for Poland. And when the matter concerns the existence and free development of all the resources of big nations, sentimental care about a few dispersed Germans and Slavs can have no significance whatsoever." *(Neue Rheinische Zeitung,* Feb. 15, 1849; VII, R. 209)

Elsewhere we have seen how Engels, to justify his and Marx's support to the Sultan of Turkey, with one stroke of his adroit pen converted the Turkish middle landlords, who mercilessly exploited their peasantry and robbed and butchered subject nationalities, into a healthy social element. This art of legerdemain was originated by Marx with respect to the majority of the Hungarian aristocracy:

"The majority of the Hungarian aristocrats, just as the majority of the Polish aristocrats, are no more than purest proletarians whose aristocratic privileges are reduced to the point where they are merely not subject to corporal punishment." (VII, R. 284)

Marx did not stop at merely changing the aristocrats into "purest proletarians." He resorted to outright deception when dealing with the internal reactionary policy of the Hungarian regime. He knew that other than some graceful "democratic" gestures, mainly on paper, very little change had occurred in the social and economic status of the Hungarian masses. As to the Jews, it was known not only in Germany but even across the Atlantic that they had remained the pariah of society in Hungary. An American Jewish bourgeois organ *The Occident* of January 1849 recorded: "In Hungary the Magyars, in revolting against the emperor, have not emancipated the Jews, though these have with alacrity joined the national standard against the Austrians and Croats." (528)

However, in the concrete pursuit of his German-nationalist goal, truth had no weight with Marx, especially where the proletariat or the Negro race or the Jewish Scapegoat was concerned. So he wrote as follows: "Having become selfreliant, the Hungarian Revolution at once began to develop rapidly. All political privileges were abolished, general electoral rights were introduced . . . The Magyar War of 1849 is much similar to the Polish War of 1830-1831. The difference

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

between the two is that all the factors which the Poles then had against themselves the Magyar War has in its favor. It is known that Lelewel futilely sought first, by freeing the peasants and the Jews, to tie the masses of the population to the revolution, and second, by arousing the whole of old Poland, to draw all the three powers that had carried out the partition into a war and make it a European war. What the Poles had carried out when it was already too late, the *Magyars began with.*" (*N. R. Zeitung*, May 19, 1849; VII, R. 285,292-3)

A little over two months after Marx wrote that one of the first measures of the Magyars had been the freeing of the Jews, Premier Szemere admitted that Hungary had committed a crime against the Jews by *not* freeing them.

2. *Marx's Pogrom Incitement Against the Polish Jews*

Poland was a key factor in the grandiose plans Marx laid out for Germany. A defeat of the Prussian autocracy at the hands of the Poles would have brought about its general defeat and thus hasten the creation of a bourgeois German republic. And the reestablishment of the Polish State in Prussian Poland would at once have involved the Poles in a war with Russia to gain the portion of Poland held by the Tsar. At this point Marx planned that a German Republic would enter the field under the guise of the big brother of Poland. "Thus the advanced party in Germany, deeming a war with Russia necessary to keep up the continental movement, and considering that the national reestablishment even of a part of Poland would inevitably lead to such a war, supported the Poles." ("Germany: Revolution and Counter-Revolution." *S. W.* II, 90)

Elsewhere we have cited a letter Engels wrote to Marx in which he outlined his conclusion that Poland could not exist as an independent nation and that Germany's policy should be "to take away as much as possible from Western Poland, to occupy her fortresses, especially Posen, with Germans, under the pretext of defense . . ." This letter was dated May 23, 1851, but as early as February 22, 1848 Engels showed he aimed to cross Poland, "to push Russia beyond the Dniester and Dvina" (V, R. 266), and in May 1848 Marx and he indicated the tremendous growth of their German expansionist appetite, by planning to establish an entirely new European system of States, with "Russia thrown back to the border of Asia." (VII, R. 291). In the event of the concretization of such a mammoth plan Poland would have been completely swallowed up by Germany, for German control would have extended to the Ural Mountains.

One of the lesser obstacles to this immense robber scheme of Marx and Engels was the Jewish bourgeoisie and the Jewish masses of Posen. Unlike the Jews of Hungary, who mistakingly placed confidence in their immediate oppressors, the Jews of Poland had no trust whatsoever in the goodwill of the "pure proletarians" as Marx

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

whitewashed the majority of the Polish aristocracy. And the Jews had a good reason for their attitude because a recent experience with a Polish "revolution" had taught them a lesson: "When in Warsaw, under the influence of the July Revolution in Paris, the November uprising of 1830 took place, the section of the Jewish community which hoped by a show of patriotism to improve the condition of its people bestirred itself. In December one of the 'starozakonikh' S. Gernish, submitted to the dictator Khlopnitsky a declaration in the name of a group of Jewish youth expressing readiness to form a volunteer detachment for participation in the general cause of liberation of the fatherland. The dictator replied that the Jews, having no civil rights, could not serve in the army." (Dubnov, *Newest History*, II, R. 205-6)

Quite characteristic of the nature of the 1830 Polish "revolution" was the openly anti-Semitic attitude of the "revolutionary" Minister Moravsky: " 'Let us not allow,' he said, 'Jewish blood to mix with the noble blood of the Poles. What will Europe say if in order to reconquer our independence, we will have to depend on Jewish blood.' " *(Archives Israelites,* 1848, 303; Dubnov, 206)

The Polish Jews, after 1830-31, realized, and quite correctly, that an independent aristocratic Poland could be no other than a strongly anti-Semitic Poland. In very few countries was the anti-Jewish spirit of bourgeois society as deeply imbedded and as outspoken as in Poland, and no one knew this fact better than the Polish Jews.

The Jews of the Grand Duchy of Posen had a special reason for not wanting to see the end of Prussian rule: only a year before, the Prussian autocracy had conferred on them citizenship rights and relaxed some anti-Jewish economic pressure. Viewing the situation from the angle of which oppressor was the lesser one, the Posen Jews elected to stay with Prussia. "If the Jews of Polish origin do not want Polish liberty, or to speak more correctly, if they are apathetic toward the re-establishment of the Polish nation . . . If they prefer to live under the authority of Prussia, and even of Austria, it is because despite exclusive regulations she accords them some individual guarantees that the Polish law refuses them, it is because in the oppression which she exercises there is however still a semblance of legality." *(Arch. Isr.* 1848, 303-4)

Had the Polish aristocrats renounced Jew-baiting and offered political and social equality to the Jews in Posen, they very likely would have won Jewish support in 1848. An indicative case is that of Cracow where the Polish leaders adopted a Liberal policy toward the Jews: "Whereas in Posen the Poles are fighting the Jews, those Jews living in Cracow are on good terms with the Poles. Of the 6,000 men in the national guard, there are 1,600 Jews, and one Jew is among the four adjutant-majors." (338). The Cracow Jews even sent an appeal to the Posen Jews to support the uprising against Prussia. But the Polish leaders in Posen not only made no gestures toward the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Jews but, instead, during the insurrection burst out with flaming hatred against the Jews; and with the first military reverses they inaugurated a campaign of pogrom terror. The pogroms were carried out "with cool calculation" according to reports in the British press: "Horrible Treatment of the Jews in Posen by the Polish Insurgents—Berlin, April 19th.—On the 15, before the Polish armed bands left Wreschen, a party of them broke into the Jewish School, and perpetrated the most shocking cruelties on all they found in it . . . If anything could increase the detestation with which these crimes are visited, it is the cool calculation with which they were perpetrated . . . These details, and others nearly as horrible, arrive by every post." (Cited from the London *Times* by the *Voice of Jacob,* May 5, 1848, 136)

Marx began the publication of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* only a few weeks after the Posen "revolutionists" and their supporting priests vented their fury upon the Jewish population. In pursuit of his scheme of expansion of German power through conquest of Russia, Marx adopted an ingratiating style toward the Posen "revolutionists" whom he and Engels would knife should the scheme be consummated. Fairly bursting with sham enthusiasm for the "Polish cause" Marx pretended to believe that in every attempt the Polish oppressors had made to restore their independent power they "at the same time fought in a revolutionary way against their own social conditions." (Aug. 19, 1848. VI, R. 383). Within this pretense he included the so-called "Revolution of 1830-31." Only a short time before the 1848 events, however, while the *Communist Manifesto* was being printed, Engels on February 22, 1848, at a Brussels meeting commemorating 1830 had declared correctly: "Let us state plainly: the uprising of 1830 was neither a national revolution, (it excluded three fourths of Poland) nor a social or political revolution. It changed nothing in the condition of the people." (V. R. 265)

But a year later when Marx hoped to make use of the Polish nobility for German purposes he gave a "progressive" interpretation to the 1830 rising: "In 1830 when the Poles rose against Russia, was there a question that at the head stood an 'aristocratic caste'? The problem was to expell the foreigners. All Europe sympathized with the 'aristocratic caste,' which, without doubt, headed the movement, since a Polish aristocratic republic was a colossal step forward compared with Russian autocracy." (Feb. 18, 1849. VII, R. 283-4)

This aristocratic "republic" was in actuality a *military dictatorship* of the Polish landlords over their serfs, over the Jews and over the Polish workers and the bourgeoisie: "On November 29, 1830, a military insurrection broke out at Warsaw, and in a short time the Russians were driven from the country. The leadership of the movement was assumed by a number of nobles, most prominent of whom was Prince Adam Szartoryski. Chlopicki was appointed dictator." (*New Int. Enc.* XVI, 16) . The sordidness of the 1830 regime can be assayed by the single fact that its extreme Left wing, represented by

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

most "democratic" member, Lelewel, preached hatred against the Jews: "Lelewel, Joachim—well-known Polish historian and political figure (1786-1861). In 1831 in the capacity of a member of the Provisional Revolutionary government, in which he represented the extreme wing, Lelewel considered that it was compatible with his democratic views to spread hatred against the Jews. Even after the crushing of the uprising when among the emigrants in Paris a young officer Beniovsky proposed that the emigrants extend a hand to the Jews since they were more oppressed than the Poles, Lelewel declared himself in opposition to such an act." (*Ev. Enc.* X, 148-9)

A Polish aristocratic, avowedly anti-Semitic military dictatorship based on serfdom, was just as reactionary as, if less powerful than, the Russian. But to win the confidence of the 1848 Polish pogromists, Marx and Engels changed their interpretation of the 1830 "revolution" led by arrogant anti-Semites.

Marx did not limit himself to the manufacture of "minor" misinterpretations in wooing the Polish pogromists but went as far as to introduce *open* incitement against the Polish Jews. The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was but a week old when Marx opened his anti-Semitic provocation-campaign: "Those Germans and Jews—an insignificant minority of the population—are attempting to utilize the present situation in the country to secure domination." (*N. R. Z.* June 9, 1848; VI, R. 155). Eleven days later Marx attacked the German elements and the Jews in Pozen as "The German-Jewish Pole-eaters . . ." (191)

The Defamation propaganda of the Polish priests and pogrom-mongers who had spread stories about the Jews poisoning the wells was reversed by Marx who presented the "well-poisoning" stories as *Jewish* accusations and calumny against the Poles! This alone would be enough to madden the defeated insurrectionists and excite them to violent anti-Jewish actions:

"We receive new and newest confirmation of the heroic-courageous and 'even in its exaggeration beautiful and elevated patriotism' with which the Jewish-German men of business launched the latest Polish robbery. The glorified pacification and reorganization plans created by the equivocal concessions to the Berlin revolutionary fever adopted in Posen by the German burocrats and Jews and implanted by the artillery of General Pful . . . Again the old Jewish stories are being spread about the poisoning of the wells and the murdering of Germans, and every attempt by the Poles to refute the calumnies levelled against them by the victors is blocked . . . Speculators and hunters for easy fortunes who entered Poland without any capital, formed the basic cadre of the German-Jewish population which in Germany now attracts the sympathies of shopkeepers and rich peasants." (*N. R. Z.* July 24, 1848; VI, R. 363, 364, 366)

Playing up to the narrowest Polish nationalist prejudices, Marx declared that the Jews and Germans in Posen had forcibly intruded

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

themselves into the Polish society. He mixed this inflammatory poison with taunting sarcasm intended to wound the national pride of the Poles: "Indeed, has not the forcible intrusion of the Jewish-German race elevated Poland to such a height of culture, to such a level of knowledge of which that country had never dreamed before? The blind, ungrateful Poles!" (VI, R. 368). In this instance, as in every case where subjective political aims required it, Marx and Engels rewrote history. It was not true that the Jews had entered Poland forcibly. While under the pressure of persecution in Western and Central Europe they had fled in every possible direction, they were actually invited into the country by the Polish rulers: "Farther east, it is well known, the Polish kings formally invited the Jews into the country so that they might build a sort of middle class between the nobility and the peasantry less dangerous to the State than the German immigrants." (Wilhelm Roscher, *Historia Judaica*, April, 1944, 23)

We have seen that Marx and Engels accused the Jews of spreading false stories that the Polish "revolutionists" were murdering the German settlers in Poland. However, here is a record of the deeds of these "revolutionists" by a contemporary British publication:

"The spirit that animated them will appear from the following circular letter addressed by the Polish Committee of Posen to that of Gotzyn, dated the 28 of March: 'We must avoid alarming the Germans, in order not to provoke a reaction; but it is important to maintain our supremacy over them. We therefore recommend your treating the Germans to their faces in a candid, straightforward manner, so that they may confide in our attachment and fraternity. But behind their backs our people are to be armed; their minds are to be inflamed with a fiery zeal.'

"Shortly after this the Poles throughout Silesia rose in arms, and turned their savage fury against their German fellow-subjects who were settled there. The details of their barbarous conduct are almost too harrowing for insertion in our pages. Hands and feet were cut off, eyes scooped out, and women in an advanced state of pregnancy beaten to death with clubs, and under circumstances of the most disgusting brutality. Murder and lust stalked triumphant through the land, and no age or sex was spared by the demons in human shape, who revelled in the tortures they inflicted." (*Annual Register* for 1848, 395)

The letter of the Polish Committee was also reported in the London *Times* of May 11, 1848. The authenticity of this treacherous policy toward the German civilians of all classes cannot be doubted. It was but logical that they reacted violently against the Polish "revolutionists" and "democrats" and when hard pressed called upon the Prussian Army for assistance. Some anti-Semites declared this to have been instigated by Jews! A portion of a letter sent from the town of Znin said: "A few deluded Germans, instigated by the Jews, pretending to consider themselves in danger, sent again for assistance,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and on the 9th another company of soldiers entered the town." (*Morning Chronicle,* May 1, 1848)

One Schtensel, who was not interested and most likely was unable to grasp Marx's involved scheme of gulping down all of Poland through a German march on Moscow, wanted Prussia to hold on to Posen and to maintain peace with Russia. He advanced an argument that Posen was well Germanized, that the Jews there were practically Germans, that they wished to be Germans and spoke German in their family circle. Marx and Engels turned upon him with stinging sarcasm. The parenthetical remark about the Jews penetrating "into the pocketbooks of the Poles" was acidly inserted by Marx and Engels in the midst of passage they quoted from Schtensel:

" 'The Jews in the Great Duchy, according to all reliable data, are complete Germans and wish to be Germans. Religious tolerance which reigned in Poland at one time, and also many national qualities of the Jews, which the Poles lacked, gave the Jews the possibility of developing in the course of centuries a wide sphere of activity which penetrated deep into the life of Poland (and particularly into the pocketbooks of the Poles). As a general rule they know both languages, although in their family circle, as their children from the early age, they speak German.' " Marx and Engels followed up this quotation from Schtensel with a redoubled attack on the Jews:

"The sudden sympathies and acknowledgements which the Jews obtained for themselves of late in Germany has found here an official expression. Rendered infamous far and wide wherever the influence of the Leiptzig fair reaches as a full embodiment of profiteering, miserliness and filth, they have suddenly become German brothers; honest Mikhel with tears of graciousness is pressing them to his bosom and Mr. Schtensel in the name of the German nation claims them as Germans who wish to remain Germans." (*N. R. Z.* Aug. 9, 1848; VI, R. 372)

Marx and Engels never forgot to provide excuses for the Polish pogromists and to continue inflaming the anti-Jewish passion of the Poles. "It is too bad, of course, that old man Arndt, composing his song, did not think of the Polish Jews and their German language. Fortunately, however, we are rescued by our Upper-Silesian paladin. Is there a person who is not familiar with the old obligations of the nobles to the Jews who in the course of centuries have become respectable? What was overlooked by the old plebeian has been noted by the knight Likhnovsky. Every place where, twisting the German language infamously, the Polish Jew-usurer is cheating everybody, there is the fatherland of Mr. Likhnovsky!" (Marx and Engels. *N. R. Z.,* Sept. 1, 1848; VI, R. 405)

It is an interesting sidelight that while Marx and Engels with Defamatory malice reduced the Jewish population of Posen to the status of usurers, pickpockets and cheats, a different story is recorded in a statistical table for 1834 supplied by A. Ruppin: "The three

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

outstanding features of this table are: the small number of professional men, rentiers, and big business men among the Jews in Posen (46 per thousand as against 129 in the rest of Prussia); the large number of artisans (tailors, furriers, glass-cutters, button-makers, hatters, etc.) . . . and a great number of non-descripts classed as in other or unspecified occupations." *(The Jews in Modern World,* 111). We have found no statistical data for 1848, but it is clear that in Posen there was already a considerable number of Jewish workers in 1834, and their number due to railroad building and other economic developments grew by 1848. But in Marx's and Engels' political—and private views—Jews were "Jews" in an opprobrious sense of classical Defamation. As to the condition of the Posen Jews during Marx's campaign of hate against them in the wake of the "revolutionary" pogroms, the Jewish bourgeois press of those days recorded: "Distress among the Jews in Prussian Poland.—*The Orient* states the following particulars respecting the suffering condition of the Jews in Prussian Poland, in consequence of the late revolutionary movements: 'The sanguinary contests of the past months, in which we had to mourn the loss of many Jewish lives, have been followed by a state of things which presses heavily on the Jewish community. The large portion of the Jews, who live among and by the Poles, are now sufferers from the deep-rooted hate which the latter continue to nourish. The Poles refuse to employ a Jew, either in country or town, and it is not surprising, that, in consequence, great poverty prevails in many congregations.' " *(Jewish Chronicle,* Nov. 10, 1848)

The Polish "revolutionists" took note of the line of Marx's paper, and ". . . . the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* received very generous support from the Polish Democrats. On September 18 Vladislav Koscielsky sent the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* two thousand thalers in their name." (Nicolaievsky and Maenchen-Helfen, 173)

In 1849, although the hope of arousing the Polish oppressors against the Prussian oppressors was dwindling, Engels' and Marx's Jew-baiting and pogrom incitement did not abate. They now played up to the Polish priests by spreading the inflammatory tales that the Jews aided the Prussian Army in robbing Polish churches and in burning villages. Under Engels' pen and Marx's editorship, the Jews were transformed from the hounded and despised Scapegoat into pogromists: "The fatherly favors and merits of the Hohenzollerns consisted in that after the March Revolution, out of cowardice, they gave the most alluring promises about 'national reorganization' and then, with the growth of counter-revolution, they, with five-fold and ever wider divisions, tightened the noose on the neck of the country. Then they conditioned the 'reorganization' with 'pacification,' 'surrender of arms' and finally, when the latter condition had been fulfilled, they turned loose the 'glorious army' upon the defenseless, trusting land, in order, in alliance with the Jews, to rob churches.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

burn down villages and beat the Poles to death in public squares." (*N. R. Z.* April 29, 1848; VII, R. 356)

Marx and Engels penned another protest against counting the Polish Jews as Germans and again made a dig at the Yiddish language: "We established then that the German national-fools and speculators from the Frankfort swamp parliament, in their census calculations still described as Germans the Polish Jews although this repulsive tribe neither by its jargon nor by its origin, and only perhaps by its passion for gain, could be a relation of Frankfort." *(Ib.)*

To some people it is an enigma that a man of Jewish origin can range himself alongside the most inveterate enemies of the Jews. History shows that some of the supporters of persecutions and monstrous butcheries of the Jews were themselves Jewish. In 70 C. E. the general in the Roman Army whom Titus, son of the Roman Emperor Vespacian, entrusted with the task of razing Jerusalem and exterminating the Jews of the city, was Tiberius Julius Alexander, a Jew. "He had been born in Jerusalem, of a noble old Jewish family. His father had paid for the gold ornaments on the floor of the Temple. His uncle had been one of the great Jewish philosophers, Philo. The Jews considered Tiberius Alexander a traitor to his own nation." (R. Nunberg, *The Fighting Jews,* 32) Other eminent Jews assisting Titus were the fugitive Jewish King, Agrippa, who furnished a contingent of Jewish warriors to use against Jerusalem, and Josephus, Jewish historian and military commander, a friend of Titus.

In the Fifteenth Century the infamous Inquisitor-General Torquemada, the Hitler of Spain, who burned thousands of Jews at the stake and caused nearly a million Jews expelled from the country, was himself of Jewish extraction: "The Inquisition reached the greatest degree of its development when it was headed by the notorious Torquemada. He himself was a Jew by origin. His parents were marranos." (Shklovsky-Dioneo, *The Inquisition and the Jews in Spain,* R. 25)

In modern times many Jews have given overt or covert support to anti-Semitic agitation. "A number of anti-Semitic publications and enterprises have been supported by 'Jewish' money." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.,* III, 71). The leading anti-Semitic writer and organizer in France, Edouard Drumont, was born a Jew. *(L' Annee Sociale,* 1898, 40). "Baron Mohrenheim, Russian Ambassador to France and, ironically enough, of Polish-Jewish origin, was urging upon Nicholas II the necessity of exposing the 'Jewish conspiracy.' The conspiracy was alleged to be aiming to dethrone the Czar." (Gessner, *Some of My Best Friends Are Jews,* 50). "The 'father' of Algerian anti-Semitism was a certain Bail, a baptised Jew." *(Ev. Enc.,* II, 680). The Hapsburg royal family, which for centuries oppressed and tortured the Jews of Austria and of other countries, was partly of Jewish origin. *(Jewish Daily Bulletin,* March 2, 1930). Maxim Gorki recorded that Jewish

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

newspapermen were working for *Novoye Vremia,* the most influential Black Hundred paper under the Tsar. *(Revolutsia i Kultura,* 1917, 38)

Marx was a Jew by birth but not by acknowledgement. It must be remembered that while he contemptuously prefaced the names of persons of Jewish origin with the identifying word "Jew," he never mentioned his own Jewish origin and always characterized himself as a German—"I am by birth a German . . ." (Letter to Bolte, Nov. 23, 1871. *Sel. Cor.* 317). In the preface to *The Poverty of Philosophy* Marx describes himself as a "German economist."

The *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was a German-nationalist, Left bourgeois, *anti-Semitic* "organ of democracy." With macabre ingenuity it stimulated the anti-Jewish spirit of society, poisoning not the backward, benighted masses but the most advanced proletarians and Left capitalist elements and sought to stir up pogrom sentiment in Poland.

Marx's antipathy for the Jews, however, had very little to do with his pogrom-incitement against them in the Duchy of Posen. Marx was above all a *political* man. In 1848 he played for huge personal-burocratic and German nationalist stakes. Having a detailed knowledge of the situation he understood that the defeated Polish "revolutionists" were considerably demoralized and no amount of exhortation would have moved them to renew the uprising head-on against the victorious Prussian autocracy. Yet the establishment of an "independent" Poland was essential for the success of his plan. He knew there had been pogroms in Poland not only against the Jews but against the German civilians as well. The aristocratic Poles, smarting in defeat, were burning with hatred against both these elements. Since he completely ruled out a proletarian and peasant struggle against the Polish landlords, priests and capitalists, and oriented his politics exclusively upon these reactionary elements, there remained no other means of revitalizing them except by fanning their *national* hatred against the Polish Germans and particularly against the Jews. If the Polish "revolutionists" could have been aroused to butcher the Jews and German civilians of Posen again, this would have automatically led to a direct clash with the Prussian troops. The Poles would have found themselves staging a new insurrection against Prussia. No, Marx was prompted in his pogrom propaganda not by his hatred for the Jews, and certainly not out of dislike for the German settlers in Posen, but by his political requirements in the unique Polish situation. This situation was never repeated in history and Marx never again resorted to a pogrom incitement against the Polish Jews.

In curious contrast to Marx's and the Polish aristocracy's pogrom policy the Polish peasants in the Great Duchy of Posen were reportedly *against* the pogroms. Despite their deep love for Poland they feared the disadvantage that might ensue if their immediate oppressors, the Polish landlords, secured independent administrative power. The

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

British report of their attitude read: "The outrages against the Jewish and German population of the Grand Duchy continue; the Prussian Government officers have in many places been put to flight, their offices destroyed, and the public money carried off by armed mobs of 'patriots.' These and similar proceedings are unexpectedly opposed by the Polish peasant population of the Grand Duchy. The peasants will not submit to be governed by the Poles; they insist on remaining under the Prussian Government. They have plainly threatened to kill their landlords if the latter should dare to promote the reconstruction of a Polish kingdom. It is probable that the peasants remember their old servitude, from which the King of Prussia liberated them." (The London *Times*, April 7, 1848, 5)

To conclude the point on Marx's pogrom incitement against the Posen Jews through his paper, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, we shall present a few citations which serve as additional proof of the intellectual dishonesty of his burocratic followers. The Left Social Democrat, Otto Ruhle, wrote: "the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* under the aegis of the democratic party, was forging the steel of the revolution . . . Marx continued his campaign in the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. During the six months of its existence, the journal had done an immense amount of work, contributing in unexampled fashion to the arousing and clarifying of people's minds." *(Karl Marx,* 155, 162). To give an impression that he was thoroughly objective, Ruhle wrote in a pretended critical vein: "There was one weak spot in the multifarious and extensive programme of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. The paper gave very inadequate information regarding the labour movement during the revolution." (163). To the uninformed reader it meant that this was the sole negative feature of Marx's paper.

The Bolshevik burocrats covered up the anti-Semitic tendency of Marx's paper with these words: "*The Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was a consistent Communist paper heading the struggle of the proletariat and of the wide toiling masses." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXXVIII, 210). "From June 1, 1848, to May 19, 1849, the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* was published in Cologne with Marx as the actual editor-in-chief. His numerous articles published in that paper, which to this very day remains the best and unsurpassed organ of the revolutionary proletariat . . ." (Lenin, "Karl Marx," *Col. Wks.* XVIII, 48)

Franz Mehring went the limit of audacity and Marxist trickery in hiding and distorting the nature of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*. With unabashed boldness he singled out for special praise the very articles containing Marx's incitement against the Polish Jews and painted this pogrom literature with bright "revolutionary" colors: "The Polish articles of the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* breathe a spirit of real revolutionary passion which raises them high above the usual pro-Polish phrases indulged in by the common run of democrats, and even today they stand as an eloquent proof of the keen and penetrating political insight of their authors." *(Karl Marx,* 190)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER VI.

MARX'S SUPPORT TO THE ANTI-SEMITIC CRY OF "JEWISH HIGH FINANCE"

1. *The "Rothschild" Part of the Defamation and the Left Bourgeois Anti-Semites*

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION and the Napoleonic wars ushered in an era of expanding Capitalism in all its phases including banking. A number of wealthy Jews were among those who became financial manipulators and a few of them amassed considerable fortunes. This feature played into the hands of the native bourgeoisie of France, England, Germany and other countries. The picture of the Jew-usurer was discarded by the Defamers. More correctly, he was shaved and attired in a frock-coat and a silk hat and was personified by the Rothschild family, owners of a leading European banking firm founded about 1800. The real power in the first decades of the Nineteenth Century was not in the hands of the Jewish and Gentile banks but in the hands of the non-Jewish native industrial bourgeoisie and the landed aristocracy. Towards the end of the Century the Gentile industrial capitalists became also finance capitalists, with most of the banks coming under their control. When this occurred every objective politico-economist could discern that the *real* owner of capital—trusts, monopolies and banks—as well as the true power behind the kings and presidents was not the Jewish but the non-Jewish native bourgeoisie.

The Medieval Jew-usurer had been, legally or extra-legally, a serf of the kings and the Church. It would have been the acme of absurdity to present him to the masses as a sinister power in control of the Christian States. However, the formal equality extended to the Jews in leading bourgeois countries, the emergence of the Jewish banker and stock exchange speculator, the creation of Jewish barons (Austrian Rothschilds, 1822), helped the nobility and the native bourgeoisie to make an effective addition to the Defamation. There was started a portrayal of Jewish financiers as either ruling the world or plotting to seize and enslave it. The essence of this fraud was the reversal of the true relation of the Gentile and Jewish bourgeoisie to each other. In 1833 an English bourgeois poet and novelist, W. M. Thackeray, composed a poem which vividly illustrates the point:

"Here's the pillar of 'change.' Nathan Rothschild himself,
With whose fame every bourse in the universe rings;
The first Baron Juif; by the grace of his pelf,
Not 'The King of the Jews' but the 'Jew of the Kings' . . .
Who plays with new Kings as young Missus with dolls"; (Cited by M. F. Modder, *The Jew in the Literature of England*, 166)

Thackeray pictured the world in the power of the Jewish Stock Exchange speculators: "The Jewish city is lost to Jewish men; but have they not taken the world in Exchange?" *(Codlingsby)*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Other Defamation writers did not consider it an accomplished fact and spoke of the Jewish financiers scheming to dominate the world. Drumont records: "About 1835 appeared a work of a certain Reno Becur, of which we have been able to discover only a review because the Jews destroy all books that judge them with a degree of sternness. The book is entitled: 'Full exposure of the world-wide plot of the Jews, dedicated to all Monarchs of Europe, their ministers, state officials and in general to all classes of society that are threatened by these insidious designs.'" *(Jewish France,* R. 270)

In 1844 Benjamin Disraeli, later to become Prime Minister of England, published his *Coningsby* in which he had one of his characters warn Coningsby,—in reality, the bourgeoisie—of the supposed danger from the Jews: "The Tories lose an important election at a critical moment; 'tis the Jews come forward to vote against them. The Church is alarmed at the scheme of a latitudinarian university, and learns with relief that funds are not forthcoming for its establishment,' a Jew immediately advances and endows it. Yet the Jews, Coningsby, are essentially Tories. Toryism, indeed, is but copied from the mighty prototype which has fashioned Europe. And every generation they must become more powerful and more dangerous to the society which is hostile to them." (231)

Tsarist diplomacy and the approaching 1848 revolution in Europe Disraeli pictured to be Jewish: "The mysterious Russian Diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and principally carried on by Jews; that mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and greater Reformation, and of which so little is as yet known in England, is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews, who almost monopolize the professional chairs of Germany." (231-2)

Drumont stated that the Jews led the Commune and safeguarded Rothschild's property in Paris: "In the next year, 1871, in Paris, under the aegis of the Commune, who committed wholesale murders with the intent of robbery and arson with kerosene in order to conceal the theft or to destroy credit papers? *The Jews!* Who were the leaders of this very Commune and guided it in such a way that Jewish property everywhere remained untouched and not a single Paris house of Rothschild was even attacked by the Communards? The Jews!" *(La France juive devant l'opinion.* Cited by A. Shmakov in *Jewish Speeches,* R. LXXV)

An eminent German-Jewish bourgeois economist, Werner Sombart, anti-Semitically "analyzed" the supposed rise of Jewish financiers to power through the following pseudo-scientific observations: "From continually dealing in money, the Jews have more and more grown accustomed to consider and evaluate the world, not from the natural qualitative aspect. They have, as a result, laid bare all the mysteries that were hidden in money, they have become the masters of money, and thanks to this mastery of money, they are the rulers

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the world, as I have exhaustively shown in the early chapters of this work." (*The Jews in Economic Life,* 426-7). "There is only one power in Europe and that is Rothschild." (*The Jews and Modern Capitalism,* 99) Wealthy Jews were branded as members of a world-wide Jewish financial fraternity: "Die goldene Internationale ('The Golden International') was the watchword of modern Jew-baiting, which ever assumed greater proportions." (G. Kappeles, *Jews and Judaism,* 53)

The Left anti-Semites of different persuasions took an active part in composing and circulating the "Jewish-power" myth. Among others we have mentioned Toussenel. His book was titled *Les juif rois de l'epoque. Histoire de la feodolite financiere.* In this work the Jewish fiananciers were pictured as the masters of society. Considerably more influential among the French workers was the anti-Semitic father of Anarchism, Proudhon. To solidify the deception that the Jewish bourgeoisie was acquiring power over the French State he pretended to have learned of a similar situation in history—an Ancient Jewish plot to conquer the Roman Empire: "To take the Empire by assault, by trade, by money, by an idea and by arms, was a plan which, even though never avowed by anyone, even though never the result of a council, nor the work of a leader, nevertheless did exist in concrete form (a l'etat concret), although perhaps never well thought out, among all the Jews in all the world. All that was lacking were the direction and unity." (*Cesarisme et christianisme,* I, 140. Cited in *Historia Judaica,* April 1948, 69)

In 1846 Proudhon published his famous work *Philosophie de la Misere* in which he stated that "The Jews, often unfaithful to Jehova, but always faithful to Mammon . . ." (*Systeme des contradictions economiques ou philosophie de la misere,* II, 139)

During the dictatorship of Louis Bonaparte Proudhon continued to indoctrinate the advanced workers with the delusion that Jewish money controlled the political life of France and Germany: "The Jews own the newspapers and run the politics in Germany just as they do in France." (*Correspondence,* XI, 354—Jan. 29, 1862. Cited in *H. J.* 69)

Proudhon formulated his opposition to an independent Poland because it would somehow give rise in France and everywhere else to "the triumph of industrial feudalism, the reign of the Jews, the first cause and the basis of modern pauperism." ("Si les traites," 1863, *Oeuvres,* VIII, 313. Cited in *H. J.* 70)

There was a difference between the Left, or "revolutionary" anti-Semitism and the Right, the stereotyped anti-Semitism. The Left cultivated the poison among the most advanced elements, the Right reached mainly into the backward masses. The effects were identical, and often the very same features were used, as for example the "Rothschild" target. In the pogroms in Hungary in 1844 incited by Rightist anti-Semites the peasants were stirred up by agents of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

landlords with a tale that "Rothschild" was the cause of the hunger and privations of the people. A picture of Rothschild was provided for the occasion: "From several other villages in Hungary the Israelites have been expelled, and the portrait of M. I. Rothschild torn to pieces by these barbarian hordes." *(Arch. Isr.* Aug. 1844; Ayerst, *The Jews of the Nineteenth Century,* 376). On the other hand, the proletariat of Paris was indoctrinated with the anti-Rothschild ideology by the Left anti-Semites. Rothschild was neither worse nor better than the Gentile bankers; he was singled out as a target only because he was a *Jew.* A heavy investor in railroads, Rothschild was especially set upon by the Left anti-Semites after a large railroad wreck near Paris in July 1846. Wincing under growing attacks, Rothschild attempted to counteract them with some measures of philanthropy, but the Left anti-Semites knew how to get around his tactic: "In addition the crop failed in 1846 and there was a widespread fear of hunger. Rothschild imported a large transport of corn and organized the free distribution of bread among the poor. However, the effects of his philanthropy proved to be the opposite of what he had expected. People started whispering that Rothschild had stored up huge reserves of corn for speculation and that his bread was poisoned. Toussenel's book had already broken the ground and there began to appear various leaflets scolding the railroad owners, the Jews and Rothschild I, their King." *(Jewish Social Studies,* IX, 1947, 51)

Not many weeks after Louis Philippe had been overthrown, Proudhon told the workers and the petty-bourgeoisie: "The Jews, again the Jews, always the Jews! Under the Republic, just as under Louis-Philippe, and under Louis XIV, we are at the mercy of the Jews." *(Representant du Peuple,* May 10, 1848, *Oeuvres,* XVII, 31)

When Louis Bonaparte as President of the Republic appointed Fould, a Jewish banker, to the post of Finance Minister, Proudhon defined the shift from the reign of Louis Philippe to the regime of Bonaparte as "France merely changed Jews." (Cited by Drumont, *Jewish France,* R. 281). The Jewish bourgeoisie registered a meek protest: "The Red Press and Tolerance! If there is one well observed truth, it is that the newspapers which regard as their primary objective the complete reform of society, of extirpating prejudices, are themselves imbued with the most deplorable prejudices . . . If you read the *Peuple* (edited by Proudhon), it will say to you in speaking of Mr. Rothschild under the Government of Louis Philippe, and of Mr. Fould under the Presidency of Louis Bonaparte, that France has only changed Jews. Is this a Republican position, that is to say, freed from all religious intolerance?" *(Arch. Isr.* 1849, 180)

2. *Marx's "Revolutionary" Anti-Semitism*

Marx and Engels also fired anti-Semitic salvos at the Rothschild target. The anti-Semitic movement had already assumed the aspect of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

defiling the Jewish character rather than denouncing the Jewish religion, as had been the practice of the Church in the Middle Ages. "Typical of a vast pamphlet literature of the age is G. M. Matthieu-Dernvaells's *Historie edifiante et curieuse de Rothschild Ier, Roi des juifs.* This pamphlet, which appeared in at least nineteen editions in 1846 under the appropriate pseudonym of 'Satan,' contended not only that 'the Kingdom of Rothschild I is today officially recognized,' but concluded with the expostulation: 'It is not the creed of the Jews to which this pamphlet addresses itself, but to their sharpness, their insolence of slaves of yesterday who had become free and rich today, to their thirst for gold and their irrepressible drive for wealth and power.' " (S. W. Baron, *Jewish Social Studies,* July 1949, 205-6). Engels expressed strong approval of this anti-Semitic pamphlet. He wrote in *Northern Star:* "But there has been started in Paris, a short time ago, a new mode of attack which deserves to be mentioned. A working man has written a pamphlet against the head of the system, not against Louis-Philippe, but against 'Rothschild I. King of the Jews.' The success of this pamphlet, (it has now gone through some twenty editions,) shows how much this was an attack in the right direction. King Rothschild has been obliged to publish two defences against these attacks of a man whom nobody knows, and the whole of whose property consists in the suit of clothes he wears." (Gesamtausgabe, VI, 341. Cited by E. Silberner, *Jewish Social Studies,* October 1949, 26)

Engels defined the political power in France as a partnership of Louis Philippe and Rothschild: "Were Rothschild and Louis Philippe to lose their reason to such an extent they would very soon lose their power, but neither would the Jews renounce huckstery nor the bourgeoisie forget about property." (V. R. 119)

While in the Revolution of 1848 Marx confined his anti-Semitism to the German-Polish situation, in 1850, when he again became a "Communist," he shifted it to the French scene. Marx, as we have seen, was capable of the crudest pogrom-incitement; but he was also capable of the most elaborate intellectual "revolutionary" anti-Semitism. At the Left-most moment in his life, in the period when he and Engels drafted the *Address to the Communist League,* Marx wrote *The Class Struggles in France.* Purportedly a classic of proletarian-scientific analysis of the social and political events in France in the years 1848-1850, the book was an intricate meshing of many political distortions interspersed with Left anti-Semitism. The very presentation of the basic power of the French State before 1848 was an anti-Semitic fraud. Like many other Left anti-Semites, Marx pictured the Jewish financiers as ruling France!

"The industrial bourgeoisie saw its interests endangered, the petty bourgeoisie was filled with moral indignation, the imagination of the people was offended, Paris was flooded with pamphlets—*'la dynastie Rothschild,'* 'les juifs rois de l'epoque,' [*The Rothschild*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

dynasty, The Jewish Kings of the Epoch] etc.—in which the rule of the finance aristocracy was denounced and stigmatised with greater or less wit.

"Rien pour la gloire! Glory brings no profit! La paix partout et toujours! War depresses the quotations of the three and four per cents! the France of the Bourse Jews had inscribed on her banner." *(Sel. Wks.* II, 196-197)

Among the anti-Semitic pamphlets which Marx mentioned we note Toussenel's *Jewish Kings of the Epoch.* Marx not only spoke of it approvingly but directly in line with it by "analyzing" the situation as a supposed struggle of the native France against "the France of the Bourse Jews." The nature of Toussenel's work has already been indicated. To show what Marx approved we shall give two excerpts from it. First, Toussenel put the blame for Napoleon's military collapse on the Jews! "Moscow and Waterloo—these are the names to be remembered for the interference of the Jews in our national affairs." Next Toussenel gave an "explanation" for the universal hatred against the Jewish Scapegoat which savored of the Middle Ages: "The universal repulsion inspired by the Jew for such a long time was nothing but just punishment for his implacable pride, and our contempt, the legitimate reprisal for the hate which he seems to bear for the rest of mankind."

The February Revolution of 1848 was carried out, in the main, by the Paris workers mostly against the dictatorship of Guizot and only vaguely against Capitalism. Many secondary social elements such as the petty-bourgeoisie, the Orleanist and the Bonapartist supporters, were also involved. Marx, however, wrote that it was the petty-bourgeoisie which had carried out the Revolution and that the rising was against Jewish financiers! "The sums deposited in the savings banks were confiscated and by decree transformed into unredeemable state debt. This embittered the already hard pressed *petty bourgeois* against the republic. Since he received, in place of his savings bank books, state debt certificates, he was forced to go to the Bourse in order to sell them and in this way delivered himself directly into the hands of the Bourse Jews, against whom he had made the February Revolution." *(S. W.* II, 208)

In these words Marx paraphrased Proudhon's "The Jews, again the Jews, always the Jews!" and "France merely changed Jews." The Revolution of 1848 in France, according to Marx, began with the fight against "the Bourse Jews" and ended with their victory, and one of the signs of this victory was "the Bourse Jew, Fould, now French Finance Minister." (210)

3. *Marx and the Issue of Admitting Jews to the British Parliament*

The Jewish bourgeoisie of England and a portion of the British ruling classes were pressing for the removal of Jewish disabilities and the admission of Jews into Parliament. The British Rothschild was

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

elected as representative of London but was unable to take his seat because of the Christian form of the oath. The Bill for modifying the oath and thus allowing the Jews to enter Parliament was defeated time and again. Marx's reaction to the ever-repeated attempts to let Rothschild take his seat was: "It is doubtful whether the British people will be very much pleased by extending the electoral rights to a Jewish usurer . . ." (IX, R. 105). Equating the Jews and usury, Marx viewed the exclusion of Jews as an aberration, since, he said, the British Parliament had long been dominated by the spirit of usury. With particular relish he quoted an anti-Semitic attack by the young Sir Robert Peel against the measure. Marx commented:

"The exclusion of Jews from the House of Commons, after the spirit of usury has so long presided in the British Parliament, is unquestionably an absurd anomaly . . ." *(N. Y. Tribune,* March 15, 1853, 6: IX, R. 115)

4. *Marx's Anti-Semitism a Support to the Blood Accusation*

When Capitalism took over the anti-Jewish Defamation a novel feature appeared in connection with the Blood Accusation, lending it greater strength. During Feudalism the Jews who were charged with ritual murder were almost certain to be put to death. If, in isolated cases, the execution was stayed and the condemned acquitted, it was due to the intercession of the Church or a ruling aristocrat. No tales were circulated among the masses that the acquittals were due to the power exercised by the Jews over the spiritual and temporal rulers. It was known that on such occassions the role of the Jewish usurers, rabbis, merchants and other leading elements within the Scapegoat group was restricted to humbly petitioning the Vatican or a king for justice. With the "emancipation," however, and definitely with the concoction of the myth which pictured the Jewish financial *agents* of the European monarchies as *masters* of Europe, the clearing of a Jew of the charge of ritual murder was interpreted by the Defamers to be due to backstage machinations of Rothschild and other Jewish financiers. In the eyes of the gullible the defendant was guilty. As a consequence the hatred for the Jews and their "power of gold" was intensified.

The outcome of the Damascus Affair was interpreted by the Right anti-Semites as a victory of Jewish gold over truth. Rothschild was portrayed in the affair as a power before which the kings and the pope trembled. This fabrication was disseminated in the United States by a leading American bourgeois newspaper *The New York Herald:*

"Rothschild, foreseeing the consequences of such a deed—the repugnance and abhorrence it would create throughout the rest of the civilized world, and the shame, the dishonor, and the ignominy it would entail upon the Jewish nation—used all his influence to prevent an investigation into the matter, and succeeded, by some means,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in prevailing upon the Austrian Cabinet, that the Austrian consul in Damascus should nullify the indictment . . . The Austrian consul at Damascus received, as a recompense for the zeal he manifested in this movement, immense sums of money, with which he built a marble palace, which, even at the present day, constitutes one of the greatest curiosities in the East. It was in this way, and through these means, that Rothschild obtained the suppression of the trial . . .

"Pope Gregory XVI, perceiving in this circumstance a probable triumph for the Catholic religion, sent Cardinal Bemetti to Damascus to renew the trial, and to gather all possible accounts relative to the murder. But Rothschild, fearing from this side, that the matter might come to publicity again, overcame the papal government by the influence of gold, and Cardinal Bemetti was recalled . . . Notwithstanding, however, all these endeavors on the part of Mr. Rothschild and the Jewish nation, to bury this horrid deed in obscurity, the original copy of the trial has been preserved. Unfortunately for the perpetrators, the manuscript is at present in this city, and will very shortly come before the public in the shape of a book, illustrated with the portrait of the two unhappy martyrs, and other engravings, representing some of the horrible scenes of this murderous sacrifice on the altar of religious atrocity." (*N. Y. Herald,* April 6, 1850. Cited in *The Asmonean,* April 12, 1850)

As we see, the "Rothschild" part of the Defamation was correlated with the Blood Accusation.

We have not found any evidence to show that Marx ever gave credence to the Blood Accusation. He was silent about this mode of frame-up of the Jewish group and the political implications inherent in this form of persecution. His silence covered not only all the preceding centuries but, and this is all-important, the numerous ritual trials occurring during the half century of his intellectual life. But worse, Marx aided the manipulators of the "Jewish gold" part of the Blood Accusation by contributing anti-Semitic ammunition of a Right-most variety in his article "The Russian Loan." This article was published anonymously. However, the Stalin historians, recording Marx's day by day activity, show that in 1855 he sent it to the newspaper and give the issue of the *Tribune* carrying it: "About 18 of December. Sends the article 'The Russian Loan.' *Tribune,* January 4, 1856." (Institute Marx-Engels-Lenin, *Karl Marx, Chronology of His Life and Activity,* R. 146). The article was reprinted in a compilation *The Eastern Question* by Marx, edited by his daughter Eleanor and her husband Ed. Aveling. We cite some of the crassest anti-Semitic phrases from this article:

"Here and there and everywhere that a little capital courts investment, there is ever one of these Jews ready to make a little suggestion or place a little bit of a loan. The smartest highwayman in the Abruzzi is not better posted up about the locale of the hard cash in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

a traveler's valise or pocket than those Jews about any loose capital in the hands of a trader.

"These small Jewish agents draw their supplies from the big Jewish houses . . . like the great London Jew, Sir Moses Montefiore . . . His office, near the Amstel, in Amsterdam, is one of the most picturesque imaginable. Crowds of these Jewish agents assemble there every day, together with numerous Jewish theologians, and around its doors are congregated all sorts and manners of Armenian, Jerusalem, barbaresque, and Polish beggars, in long robes and Oriental turbans. The language spoken smells strongly of Babel, and the perfume which otherwise pervades the place is by no means of a choice kind.

"The next Jewish loan-mongering concern is that of Konigswarter, who came from a Jewish colony in Furth in Bavaria, opposite Nuremberg, whose 10,000 inhabitants are all Jews with some few Roman Catholic exceptions . . . Then we have the Raphaels, who also have houses in London and Paris, who belong, like Konigswarter, to the lowest class of loan-mongering Jews."

Readers of anti-Semitic literature always knew that the Jewish bankers were blamed for the wars carried on by the kings and Tsars and the international bourgeoisie. But they could hardly suspect that a "Communist" wrote these lines: "Thus we find every tyrant backed by a Jew, as is every pope by a Jesuit. In truth, the cravings of the oppressors would be hopeless, and the practicability of war out of the question, if there were not an army of Jesuits to smother thought and a handful of Jews to ransack pockets."

Marx, of course, realized that many readers could discern that this was not an attack upon loan-mongers as such but exclusively upon *Jewish* loan-mongers. Therefore, in a vein of introducing a neglected truth, Marx assured the readers that Jewish loan-mongers were far worse than any others. "The loan-mongering Jews of Europe do only on a larger and more obnoxious scale what many others do on one smaller and less significant. But it is only because the Jews are so strong that it is timely and expedient to expose and stigmatize their organization."

How "strong" the Jews were in Europe in the 1850's can be gauged by the conditions under which they lived. In Russia, Poland and Rumania nine tenths of the Jews were paupers. Their economic condition in Central Europe was half bearable, but the degree of oppression in some localities approached that of the Middle Ages:

"Jews in Austria are not permitted to acquire land or house property; in whole districts they are not permitted to reside; in many towns they are confined to a Ghetto; arriving at Vienna or other cities, they are obliged to obtain from the police a card of permission to stay, renewable every fortnight on payment of a fee. They cannot chose their own trade; from many professions they are totally excluded. Only a limited number are permitted to marry, and none without the sanction of the police." (Letter to the *Daily News*, Oct.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

19, 1853. Cited in *Asmonean,* Nov. 18, 1853). In Basel, "No Jew, without exception, is permitted to settle, to carry on commerce, trade, or any handicraft in the canton. Any citizen who admits a Jew into his house, be it for commercial purposes, as clerk or servant, or in any other capactiy, or for what other purpose soever, is liable to a fine of 300 francs." (Law of the Canton of Basel, Switzerland, Nov. 17, 1851). "At the moment of our going to press, we hear that the persecution of the Jews has reached its climax in the cantons of Basel, both city and Campagne. The Jews must leave before the 8 of May. Among the proscribed families are some who have been settled there more than fifty years." *(Ar. Isr.* Cited in *The Jewish Chronicle,* June 4, 1852)

Since Marx had cast off his "Communist" cloak when writing the anonymous article, he could freely attempt to arouse anti-Jewish hatred among the bourgeois readers by creating a scare that the "Jew organization" was a *danger to their Governments.* "Thus do these loans, which are a curse to the people, a ruin to the holders, and a danger to the Governments, become a blessing to the houses of the children of Juda. This Jew organization of loan-mongers is as dangerous to the people as the aristocratic organization of landowners. It principally sprung up in Europe since Rothschild was made a Baron by Austria, and enriched by the money earned by the Hessians in fighting the American Revolution. The fortunes amassed by these loan-mongers are immense, but the wrongs and sufferings thus entailed on the people and the encouragement thus afforded to their oppressors still remain to be told." ("The Russian Loan," N. Y. *Daily Tribune,* Jan. 4, 1856; Marx, *The Eastern Question)*

If a reader put Marx's article on the Jewish money-changers and on Rothschild, published in the *Tribune,* side by side with the article about Rothschild terrorizing the Austrian Government and the pope to suppress the "truth" about the alleged Damascus ritual murder, printed in the *Herald,* he would conclude that a powerful organization of *Jew-money* held a club over the Vatican and the governments of Europe, that due to this "Jew organization" wars were conducted and universal suffering excited, that the Blood Accusation was true and that the Jewish "murderers" could safely perpetrate their terrible ritual crimes because they were backed by Rothschild's gold. However, a more or less enlightened reader could come to no other view than that the author of the article in the *Tribune* and the author of the story in the *Herald* were both sordid Jew-baiters.

The article dealing with the Damascus affair attacked "Mr. Rothschild and the Jewish nation"; the article pertaining to the Russian loan attacked Rothschild, Montefiore and other Jewish bankers and also "small Jewish agents," "Jewish theologians," "all sorts and manners" of Jewish beggars. According to the sense of either article, any passing Jew in the street could be suspected of being a little Rothschild or a hanger-on of Rothschild. This form of anti-Semitic incite-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
_ACCEPT-

ment, made popular early in the Nineteenth Century, continued for many decades. The Stalin historians record:

"In fact the anti-Semitic agitation did not cease throughout the entire Nineteenth Century. It was popular to speak about the Jews as about some Rothschilds." *(Gr. Sov. En.* III, 70)

Only, of course, the Stalin historians maintained absolute silence about the fact that among the anti-Semitic writers who popularized the "Rothschild" agitation was Karl Marx.

CHAPTER VII.

MARXISM AND BAKUNINISM AID THE TSAR IN THE POGROMS OF 1881

1. *The Three Anti-Semitic Elite of the First International*

IT WOULD obviously be impossible to give space to an analysis of the attitude each minor leader in the First International adopted toward the Jewish Scapegoat. Of primary importance is the attitude of the major leaders, for the lesser ones were almost uniformly their devout followers. The three chiefs of the International were Marx and Engels and their factional opponent, Bakunin, who for a time influenced more workers than did Marx and Engels. Bakunin was a full-fledged anti-Semite at the time he joined the International as is seen from the fact that in October 1869 he wrote *Polemique Contre les juifs.* A portion of this piece reads:

"It is thus that we may observe in connection with the modern Jews that their nature lends itself little to frank Socialism. Their history, long before the Christian Era, implanted in them an essentially mercantile and bourgeois tendency, with the result that, considered as a nation, they are par excellence the exploiters of other men's work, and they have a natural horror and fear of the popular masses, whom they despise moreover, whether openly or in secret. The habit of exploitation, whilst developing the intelligence of the exploiters, gives it an exclusive and disastrous bent and quite contrary to the interests as well as to the instincts of the proletariat. I know that in expressing with this frankness my intimate opinion on the Jews I expose myself to enormous dangers. Many people share it, but very few dare publicly to express it, for the Jewish sect, very much more formidable than that of the Jesuits, Catholic or Protestant, constitutes today a veritable power in Europe. It reigns despotically in commerce, in the banks, and it has invaded three-quarters of German journalism and a very considerable portion of the journalism of other countries. Woe, then, to him who has the clumsiness to displease it." (Quoted in a letter to the *Morning Post* by Nesta H. Webster, July 17, 1920, and in *The Cause of the World Unrest,* 259-260)

On the matter of Jews, the only real difference between Marx and Bakunin was which particular Jewish section they politically

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

la/5.0
_ACCEPT-

hated most. To Marx nothing was more detestable than the Polish Jews, especially those in the Prussian Grand Duchy of Posen. Bakunin, sensitive to his native Russian requirements, held that no Jew was as bad as a Russian Jew: "Utin—is it necessary to state it?—is Jewish by birth, and what is even worse, he is a Russian Jew." (Bakunin, "Rapport sur l'Alliance," *Oeuvres de Bakounine,* VI, 273. Cited in *Historia Judaica,* April 1948, 75)

The name of Utin serves to bring up the national scale in Marx's and Engels' private ideology. With them, of course, the Germans stood above all nations and races. Next came the Turks, French, British, Italians, Magyars and others. Near the bottom of the scale they placed the Russians, still lower, the Southern Slavs, and beneath all, the Jews. However, a Jew who worked closely with them was cleared of the "stigma" and won for himself the title of the nationality of the country in which he was brought up. Utin was classified by them as a *Russian:* "Utin, who, despite everything, is a very fine boy (although a Russian—this, of course, is not a German or a Frenchman)." (Engels to Becker, June 14, 1872. XXVI, R. 267). Such a Jew, Marx regarded as a friend: "My friend Utin" "He is one of my best friends." (Marx to Fleckles, Sept. 21, 1876. XXVI, R. 424)

Some information on the character of this friend of Marx's is supplied by Mehring: "A master of such intrigues was a Russian fugitive named Nikolas Utin . . . In the beginning Utin had made up to Bakunin, only to be thoroughly snubbed by him, and when Bakunin left Geneva, Utin seized the opportunity to revenge himself for his wounded vanity by pursuing him with underhand slander." (450)

The fact stands out in the clearest possible light that the three highest chiefs of the International Workingmen's Association who succeeded in corralling most of the proletarian vanguard of Europe and America were deeply imbued with anti-Semitism. The Bolshevik burocrats, who valiantly shield Marx, do not mind telling the workers the truth about Bakunin: "It is known that Bakunin was a terrible anti-Semite." *(Istorik Marksist,* I, 1926, 7)

But no Marxist would point out that this anti-Semite was duly inducted by the anti-Semites Marx and Engels into their International.

2. *The Ultra-Left Bourgeois "Revolutionary" Pogromists*

Influenced by Bakunin and other political and literary anti-Semites, the Russian Narodniks or Terrorists were not only anti-Jewish in sentiment but were actual pogromists. "Towards the end of August, 1881, the Executive Committee of 'The People's Freedom' issued an appeal in which it voiced the thought that the Tsar had enslaved the free Ukrainian people and had distributed the lands rightfully belonging to the peasants among the pans (the Polish noble landowners) and officials, who extended their protection to the Jews and shared the profits with them. Therefore, the people should march

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

against the Jews, the landlords, and the Tsar. 'Assist us, therefore,' the appeal continues, 'arise, laborers, avenge yourselves on the landlords, plunder the Jews, and slay the officials!' " (S. M. Dubnov, *History of the Jews in Russia and Poland,* II, 279)

Not only did the Narodniks call for pogroms but "Data exists about the participation by individual members of the People's Will Party in the preparations of pogroms. They considered the pogroms as related phases of the revolutionary movement. It was thought that the Jewish pogroms would train the people for revolutionary struggles, that the movement which was extremely easy to direct against the Jew would in its further evolution attack the nobility and the chinovniks. In accord with this view, proclamations were prepared calling for an attack on the Jews." (Hessen, *History of the Jewish People in Russia,* R. II, 218)

On the assumption that they were advancing the cause of the peasant, the Narodniks spread hatred towards Jews in general, and by doing so helped the Tsar's agents to divert the masses from attacking the Russian landlords and the bourgeoisie. A few months after the assassination of Alexander II the Narodnik paper wrote: "The people's discontent has begun to express itself in a mass revolutionary movement which, due to local conditions, has assumed an anti-Jewish character . . . All the attention of the resisting masses is concentrated on merchants, innkeepers, usurers, in a word on Jews, this local bourgeoisie which hurriedly and passionately is skinning the toiling masses." *(Narodnaia Volia,* #6, Oct. 23, 1881. Cited in *Iskra,* #39, May 1, 1903)

Leftist anti-Semitic sentiments approving pogroms as a generally correct principle existed among the Western "revolutionists." Georges Duchene, co-editor with Proudhon of the *People's Representative,* later of the *People* and eventually editor of *The Commune* during the Paris Commune of 1871, declared: "Citizens, when you hear it said that in a reputably barbarous country, the population handles the Jews roughly, do not believe one treacherous word: it is simply honest people chasing rascals, usurers, exploiters of labor; religion has nothing to do with this act of high justice." *(L'Empire industriel,* 196. Cited in *Historia Judaica,* April 1948, 79)

3. *The Marxists and the Russian Pogroms of 1881*

Although at the early phase of his political career Marx manifested interest in the "Jewish Question," in the latter phases he virtually ignored this subject. One meets with an occasional slurring reference to Jews in *Capital,* such as: "The sum of the values in circulation can clearly not be augmented by any change in their distribution, any more than the quantity of the precious metals in a country by a Jew's selling a Queen-Anne farthing for a guinea." *(Das Kapital,* I, Ch. IV, 2, 121; *Capital,* Kerr Ed. 181). In the last

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lla/5.0
ACCEPT-

decade of his life—1873—1883—when the tide of anti-Semitism rose turbulently in Europe, above all in the German and Austrian Empires, and reached the modern pogrom stage in Russia, Marx maintained complete silence about the Jews. In his private correspondence for this period hardly any mention of the Jews is made. We have found only one. In the Summer of 1879 Marx went to Ramsgate for a rest, and in a letter to Engels complained that "Even here there are many Jews and fleas." (Aug. 25, 1879. XXIV, R. 508)

While both Marx and Engels shied away from making any public comment on the anti-Semitic fury raging at that time, their disciples, in one form or another, aided the bourgeois anti-Semitic crusaders. A leading British Socialist, H. M. Hyndman, for instance, wrote: "But the influence of the Jews at the present time is more noticeable than ever. That they are at the head of European capitalists, we are all aware." *(Nineteenth Century,* Jan. 1881, 10). Only four months later the 1881 pogroms broke out and—"Within a few weeks the whole of Western Russia, from the Black Sea to the Baltic, was smoking with the ruins of Jewish homes. Scores of Jewish women were dishonored, hundreds of men, women and children were slaughtered, and tens of thousands were reduced to beggary and left without a shelter . . . Europe had witnessed no such scenes of mob savagery since the Black Death massacres in the 14th Century." *(Enc. Brit.* II, 139)

And now there appeared a very subtle Marxist method of aid to bourgeois anti-Semitism and the Tsarist pogrom tactic. The method was laid down by Marx and Engels and circumspectly carried out by Plekhanov and other eminent Russian students of Marxism living at that time abroad. A Jewish Russian Marxist, L. Deutsch, relates an incident which occurred after the pogroms of 1881 and which throws illumination on the future line Plekhanov, Lenin and other Russian Marxists adopted in the Revolution of 1905:

"The news reaching us about the rise of anti-Semitism in our fatherland caused great bitterness among us. We considered it necessary to react to this new, extremely deplorable phenomenon and were in complete agreement in evaluating it but differed somewhat in formulating the means for the solution of the Jewish Question in Russia. Thus, by the way, I remember that P. B. Axelrod stood for transferring the Jews to Palestine, something to which the rest of us did not agree.

"Just then for the first time he and I thought of an idea of issuing a pamphlet on the question of the pogroms and the accusations levelled against the Jews. I intended to take the task upon myself but soon found that in that extremely difficult moment through which my co-nationals lived it would be of immeasurably greater significance for them if such a work were written by an eminent Gentile Socialist. Both I and also Axelrod in turn addressed this proposition to Plekhanov, Lavrov, Kravchinsky (Stepniak). But each one of them, while fully agreeing that such a pamphlet was needed,

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

did not consider himself suitable as an author but pointed to some other eminent emigrants enumerated by me. In consequence a printed defense of the oppressed nationality by a Russian Socialist, extremely necessary at that time, never appeared." (Deutsch, *The Role of the Jews in the Russian Revolutionary Movement*, R. 4-5)

As a matter of record, at that time no one in the whole Marxist movement put out a pamphlet or even an article against the Tsarist and Nihilist pogrom policy. Deutsch informs the reader that Axelrod produced something but the manuscript remained unpublished. No explanation is given. The stage was left to the sentimental bourgeois Liberals and to "reformed" anti-Semites like Victor Hugo and U. S. Grant to pretend a defense of the pogrom-ridden Jewish population in Russia.

Marx and Engels left no record of their personal feelings in the matter of the 1881 pogroms. We can only deduce, judging by their attitude towards government persecution of people whom they disliked. Elsewhere we have given an instance of Marx's cheerfulness when he learned of the arrest of French members of the International, his factional opponents. When the British Government suppressed a newspaper of an Irish faction which found no favor with Marx, he wrote to Engels on January 11, 1868: "I'm very glad that the English government is persecuting *The Irishman*. The fact is that in reality this paper is not at all Fenian, but stands only for repeal."

With respect to the pogrom situation in Russia, there is no doubt, of course, that Marx hated the Tsar—but he hated the Jews more.

CHAPTER VIII.

ANTI-SEMITISM WITHIN THE EUROPEAN PRE-1914 MARXIST MOVEMENT

1. *Engels "Evaluates" Anti-Semitism*

In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels took cognizance of all the contemporary utopian and bourgeois Socialist currents. In July 1889, when bourgeois anti-Semitic parties, labelling themselves "Socialist," had passed from the agitational to the organizational stage and obtained a wide political sway, the Marxists under Engels' direct guidance launched the Second International at Paris. However, neither in the speeches of the leaders present nor in the resolutions of the foundation Congress was anti-Semitic "Socialism" discussed. Plekhanov and Lavrov, the first representing Russian Social Democracy at the Congress, the second the pogromist People's Will, did not utter a syllable about the Tsar's policy of diverting the potential revolution into the channel of anti-Jewish pogroms.

The Jewish proletariat, under the double pressure of capitalist

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

exploitation and anti-Semitic hounding and terror, gravitated toward the Second International which, in abstract phrases, promised to lead all the oppressed to Socialism and thus effect the abolition of all the evils extant in capitalist society. The omission of an official position on anti-Semitism by the Engels-guided International was felt by the Jewish Socialist workers and some minor leaders. A year later, in 1890, Engels received a letter from a person whose name was concealed from the workers. According to all indications the writer asked Engels to evaluate anti-Semitism. Only a fragment of Engels' reply was published in the Vienna *Arbeiterzeitung* of May 9, 1890. Thus, at the age of 70, for the first time in his life, Engels expressed himself publicly on the Jewish Scapegoat Question. The published fragment contained many model distortions for his disciples to copy. The fragment began with a deliberate falsification: "Anti-Semitism is the characteristic sign of a backward civilization and is therefore only found in Prussia and Austria or in Russia." *(Sel. Cor.* 469-470). The fact was, of course, that by 1890 modern anti-Semitism had taken root in all the advanced countries of Europe and in the United States, while in backward China and India there was no anti-Semitism. Hiding the fact that Marx himself had contributed to the anti-Semitic propaganda in America, that Marx and he had peddled Fourier's "Judas Iscariot" as a sample of "criticism" of Capitalism, and disregarding the fact that the "progressive" elements of France had been polluting all social classes with anti-Semitism throughout the Nineteenth Century, Engels declared: "If an attempt at anti-Semitism were made in England or America it would simply be riduculed, and in Paris Herr Drumont after all only excites an ineffective little one-day sensation with his writings." (470). The last remark too was a falsification because in a very short time Drumont's book had gone through a *hundred* editions! *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXIII, 529)

In the concluding paragraph Engels inserted an exuberantly flattering tribute to the Jews: "And apart from this, we owe much too much to the Jews. To say nothing of Heine and Borne, Marx was of purest Jewish blood; *Lassalle was a Jew*. Many of our best people are Jews." (471. Our Emph.—G. S.)

To maintain the disguise of a true proletarian scientist Engels had to conceal his innermost repugnance toward the man whom Marx had called "Jewish Nigger" and he himself had described as a "dirty Jew from Breslau," and hypocritically present Lassalle as one of "our best people."

But cautious as Engels was, he did not take sufficient care in fully covering up his genuine feelings towards the Jews. He presented the hypothetical prospect of becoming transformed into a Jew as but a matter of chosing the *lesser evil:* "And indeed if I had to choose than rather a Jew than 'Herr *von* . . .'!"

Engels of course said something here which as all signs indicate, he definitely did not mean. With his intense German nationalism

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and his ingrained aversion to the Jews he would have certainly chosen rather to be a Prussian *von,* who after all was a Teuton like himself, than a Jew.

2. *Inverted Anti-Semitism and the Marxists*

Anti-Semitism seeks to whip up the mind of the Gentile population against the Jewish Scapegoat. And since this is the basic object, it does not matter what method accomplishes this end. The Scapegoat is presented either as being arch-reactionary or ultra-revolutionary, and in both cases as allegedly pursuing the goal of lifting the Jewish group above all others. Any idea giving the false impression that physiologically, ethnically, morally and mentally the Jews are different from all races and nations, that they in one sense or another are on parade before the rest of humanity constitutes anti-Semitism when such an idea is held in non-Jewish spheres; and a similar idea within the Jewish group itself is a powerful aid to anti-Semitism. The notion that the Jews are a "chosen people" is one of the outstanding examples. Some Jews have long since realized that this narrow-minded presumptuousness and nationalist arrogance serves not the Jews but anti-Semitism. Thus, a Jewish Liberal writes: "All people like to be a 'chosen people.' It can readily be seen, therefore, why the assumption of the Jews that they are the 'chosen people' should not be relished by others, especially when the other peoples are powerful majorities. This claim of special election was a perennial challenge to Gentile egotism: it has been interpreted as smugness and conceit on the part of the Jews, both of which arouse resentment and antagonism." (I. Graeber, *Jews in a Gentile World,* 70)

Inverted anti-Semitism is not a new phenomenon. It was extant throughout the centuries and has been given currency either by shrewd bourgeois and Marxist politicians or by sentimental, well-meaning but unobserving persons. A classic example of such anti-Semitism during the Feudal ages is Luther's writings when he made attempts to arrive at a deal with the Jewish religious leaders. Knowing full-well that they were an object of abomination to the Catholic Church he paid court to them thus: "The Jews are the best blood on earth." *(Sammtliche Werke,* XXV, 409; cited by C. Bender in *From Luther to Hitler,* 7). When Luther's policy changed he wrote in his work *About the Jews and their Lies:* "The sun never has shone on such a bloodthirsty and vindictive people who cherish the idea of murdering and strangling the heathen." *(Table Talks,* XXXII, 120). Although different in form both statements were anti-Semitic.

With the steady influx of the Jewish masses into the Marxist movement it became imperative for the German, Russian and other national burocrats to conceal the anti-Semitism of the founders of the movement, and often their own. Since it was impossible for them to make an honest study and presentation of the subject, for it would

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

have inevitably involved the exposure of Marx and Engels—the only alternative was the introduction of a brand of anti-Semitism with its supposedly underlying warmth and sympathy for the persecuted Jews. We have already cited Engels. The Jewish workers, reading the fragment of his reply to an "unknown" correspondent, could never have suspected that behind this statement was concealed a passionate German nationalist and inveterate Jew-hater. So when he died "Near the end of 1895 representatives of 32 Jewish workers trade organizations . . . expressed their profound sorrow on the death of the teacher of the international proletariat, Friedrich Engels." (Report on the Jewish Workers Movement to the International Socialist Congress in Paris, 1900)

Among the eminent Russian Marxists who gave the workers a typically Liberal "appreciation" of the Jews were Plekhanov, Martov and Lenin. The magazine they edited said "The Jewish race has rendered the world the greatest service." *(Iskra,* #51, Oct. 22, 1903). The Jewish workers, reading *Iskra,* were completely duped and never inquired of their leaders what Marx's policy had been on the pogroms of 1881 and on anti-Semitism in general. And while imbuing them with the false pride and delusion of the supereminence of the Jewish "race," the Marxist leadership, by avoiding the struggle against the Tsar's anti-Jewish policy in 1905, rendered them helpless victim of the Black Hundreds.

In the Marxist movement the Russians were the greatest disseminators of inverted anti-Semitism; and in this art no one ever surpassed Gorky. At a Socialist meeting in New York, he declared: "The Jews are a people with a highly-lifted torch with which they illuminate the path of mankind. They gave religion to the Christians and they themselves are now the most outstanding bearers and interpreters of a new religion—Socialism, for Socialism, no matter whether it is viewed from a theoretical or philosophical point of view contains within itself the spirit and fire of religion."

3. *Disguised and Open Anti-Semitism in the First Stages of the Second International*

After their experience with huge factional oppositions in the First International, Marx and Engels resolved that the next International would be entirely Marxist (Engels to Sorge, Sept. 12-17, 1874). Without a strong French Marxist movement such an International was out of the question. The situation turned in favor of Marxism in France through the offices primarily of Guesde. "The most zealous and successful champion of Marxism in France was the former Bakunist, Jules Guesde. Marx and Engels did not exchange letters with him, since they could influence him indirectly through his closest coadjutor, Lafargue, who was Marx's son-in-law. But Guesde personally came to them for advice when it was time to draft a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

program for the first French working-class party on the Marxist model. The meeting took place in Engels's study. It was an important one, for it was the first opportunity the friends had had of exercising any direct influence on the ideas of the French proletariat." (Mayer, *Friedrich Engels,* 267). It was when Guesde was a fully-developed Marxist that he wrote, during Engels' lifetime, a strongly-worded anti-Semitic "Rothschild" diatribe:

"One can not only propose, but actually vote, as did the municipal council of Paris, the return to the nation—or the confiscation—of the wealth of the one-time Royal or Imperial families, and as the minority of the same council, demand the immediate arrest of the members of these families. If they ruled, they rule no more. But don't think you can prescribe the same medicine for the wicked Jew of Frankfort who has been installed for nearly a century, as a gigantic octopus, in the heart of France, from which he draws the blood by all his suckers, or woe be to you!" *(Le Cri du Peuple,* June 17, 1886; from Jules Guesde's *Etat, Politique et Morale de Classe,* 442)

Guesde was one of the leading figures among the founders of the Second International (July 1889)

In the Second International the question of anti-Semitism was officially brought up at the Brussels Congress (August 16-22, 1891). Here is part of Plekhanov's subsequent report on the matter:

"The Congress passed over to the question which for us Russians has a great practical significance, namely, the *Jewish question* . . . The Russian-American Jews took the most active part in the May 1st demonstration. No wonder, then, that at the Brussels International Socialist Congress we also meet with their representative . . . Comrade Cahan. 'I came here not as a Jew but as a worker,' he said. 'Factually for the Socialists the Jewish question exists to no greater degree than the war question (the question of militarism). But circumstances force us to discuss the war question . . . The Russian press always attacks the Jews, making sure that we are hated even by the workers-Socialists. I ask you to declare that this is a lie, that you are the enemies of all exploiters of Jews as well as of Christians (prolonged applause) that you sympathize with the Jewish workers as with Christian workers (applause). This will be an answer to the calumny of the Russian press and will give the Jews a possibility to take part in the cause of liberation of the proletariat (applause).' " *(Social Democrat,* #4, Supplement, "Workers Movement in 1891," R. 105-6)

A Belgian Socialist, Volders, submitted a proposal to condemn anti-Semitism, but the French Socialist anti-Semites objected:

"Volders' proposal evoked an opposition from several representatives. The attorney Arjiriades demanded that the Congress express itself not only against anti-Semitic (anti-Jewish) but also against *philo-Semitic* instigations (i. e., instigations *in favor* of Jews and against persons of other religions). Dr. Reynar, condemning persecution of the Jews, considered, however, that there existed also a Semitic ques-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tion forming a part of the social: 'namely, the question of Jewish banks, a serious question, that would end with ruining us all.' After considerably ardent arguments the Congress accepted Volders' proposal with the correction offered by Arjiriades.

"We must confess that this did not satisfy us. Having adopted this decision the Congress in actuality refused to examine the Jewish question. The refusal was based on the idea that the Socialist proletariat never occupied itself and could not occupy itself with the anti-Jewish persecution. This, of course, is very true, but it proves nothing." *(Ib.)*

It is obvious that the young Jewish Socialist from America did not know Marxism otherwise he would have realized he was treading on very dangerous grounds. However, Jewish Marxists from Austria and Germany knew better and sided with the French. Victor Adler, founder and leader of the Austrian Social Democratic Labor Party, and Paul Singer, leading member of the German Social Democratic Labor Party and frequent chairman of its congresses, both Jewish, strongly objected to dealing with the question of anti-Semitism. "In 1891 Adler at the International Socialist Congress in Brussels, together with Singer, came out against condemning anti-Semitism by the Congress, considering that such a question was unnecessarily raised at the Socialist Congress." *(Ev. Enc.* I, 490)

The suppression of an attempted investigation of anti-Semitism served as a stimulant not to the study of the phenomenon but to the further cultivation of the anti-Semitic virus within the Marxist movement. In the French section of the International anti-Semitism soon grew feverishly. The ground in French society, as has been shown elsewhere, had been already well saturated with the virus. The keynote was still "Rothschild" and "Jewish high finance." Emil Zola in *L'Argent* (1891) pictured an avaricious Jewish banker, a "Rothschild" named Gundermann, and a "decent" but ill-fated Christian banker. Zola used the Defamation language when he spoke of "Jewish high finance." Guy de Maupasant in *Mont-Oriol* (1887) dramatically presented a French noble, financially hard pressed, inducing his daughter Christine to marry the "Jew" banker Andermott.

In the Autumn of 1892 France and the whole world resounded with the Panama Scandal. A French financial company which had undertaken to build the Panama Canal went bankrupt and the subscribers to the enterprise lost their investments. A number of government officials, senators and deputies of the Chamber were involved, and since some Jewish financiers had participated in the affair it was convenient to set the tinder afire against the Jews and divert the attention of the masses and the petty-bourgeoisie who had lost their savings. "Between the Socialists and the anti-Semites a real rivalry arose for gaining control over the oppositionally-minded elements . . . Anti-Semitic-Socialist fog enveloped the whole of France, the Socialists Ruane and Viviani in the Chamber delivered sharp anti-Semitic

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

speeches and the Bonapartists and clericals trumpeted about their democratism and Socialism. They all seemingly were seized with one feeling—the feeling of hatred toward 'the capitalist order of the Republic,' some sincerely, others hypocritically and systematically substituted the word 'capitalist' with its synonym 'Jewish.' Thus against the Jews as representatives of capital a simultaneous attack was conducted from the Right and Left." *(Ev. Enc.* II, 678). In that period the leading orator of French Social Democracy denounced and vilified the Jews in vehement words: "What is it still if not these Jews, closely knit together among themselves, who are separated from other men as enemies and who are isolated effectively by blood, religion, lucrative profession, and by a common hate of the rest of humanity, who control all business, all wealth, who bend all free men under the yoke of money? What is therefore the Jewry if it is not a dangerous State within a State?" (Jean Jaures, *De l'etat Chez Kant et Fichte* in a series *Les Origines Du Socialisme Allemande* in *La Revue Socialiste* (1892); *Oeuvres de Jean Jaures,* III, *Etudes Socialistes,* I, 1888-1897, 84-87)

The German Marxists lent a hand to their Socialist "comrades" in France. Here is the official declaration of German Social Democracy on the question of anti-Semitism:

"The Social Democratic Party fights anti-Semitism as a movement which is directed against the natural development of society but which, in spite of its reactionary character, and against its will, is bound to become revolutionary. This must happen because the urban and rural petty bourgeois groups which are being aroused by the anti-Semitic leaders against the Jewish capitalists will finally understand that their enemy is not only the Jewish capitalist but the capitalist class itself and that only the success of socialism can liberate them from their distress." (From Bebel's Resolution adopted at the Cologne Convention of the German Social Democratic Party, 1893. Cited by P. W. Massing, *Rehearsal for Disaster,* 182). "Fortunate that the process of putrefection and decomposition is so swift. Anti-Semitism itself must further it. Barbarous as it is, it is a bearer of culture against its will—cultural manure for Socialism in the truest sense of the word. Let us, therefore, rejoice over the successes of anti-Semitism, a heavy blow for all other capitalist parties, almost as much as we do over our own." *(Vorwarts,* June 26, 1893. Cited by Massing, 264)

Drumont's *Libre Parole,* by its agitation against Jewish officers, laid a fertile ground for the Dreyfus Affair; indeed it was the first journal to announce his arrest on the 15th October 1894. The Dreyfus Affair disclosed the appalling state of anti-Semitic corruption of the Second International. The French Government acted as a frame-up agency through its War Ministry which "tried" Dreyfus. "War Minister Mercier was not only lauded by the bourgeois press at every fresh turn of the trial but even Jaures' paper, the organ of the Socialists, congratulated him on 'having opposed the formidable pres-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sure of corrupt politicians and high finance.' Characteristically this encomium drew from the *Libre Parole* the unstinted commendation 'Bravo Jaures!' " *(Jewish Soc. Studies,* July 1942, 216)

Under the guise of fighting for Socialism, the French Social Democrats, to the astonishment of Jews, Liberals and even the anti-Semites of the Right, almost recklessly displayed their anti-Semitic character. Rene Viviani, who remained a member of the Socialist Party until 1906, declared: "In Algeria, anti-Semitism is the best form of social struggle." (Cited by Z. Szajkowski in *Jewish Social Studies,* July 1948, 271). "On February 21, 1895 Viviani exclaimed in parliament: 'I demand that Algeria be freed from Jewish tyranny' . . . from the 'legendary piracy which makes the Jews the best aids to capitalist exploitation.' This outburst was met with applause by the entire Left." (273)

During the Dreyfus Affair many Liberals felt that the French Republic would gain in strength and prestige if the injustice to the Jewish officer were rectified. On January 13, 1898 Emile Zola, though bearing a share of guilt for saturating the atmosphere with anti-Semitism, published *J'accuse,* denouncing the conspirators who had framed Dreyfus. Jaures immediately asserted that the "Jewish thieves" would profit by Zola's act: " 'behind his energetic and noble effort the entire suspect band of Jewish thieves march slyly and avidly, obtaining from him I don't know what indirect rehabilitation, essential to the pursuit of new misdeeds. Behind the disseminator of good deeds operate the voracious birds who make their profit from the seed of justice before they are to blossom and, by a singular repercussion, Zola, in beating back a part of the forces of oppression, risks restoring a part of the forces of exploitation.' " *(L'Anee Sociale,* 1898, 5). During the discussions on Algeria on February 19, 1898 Jaures said: " 'The Jews took too much advantage of their economic power and their increased influence, which they gained by their naturalization, and thus deepened the crisis of the Arab nation.' " (Z. Szajkowski, *Jewish Social Studies,* July 1948, 273)

The leaders of Russian Marxism, Plekhanov and Lenin, maintained a strange silence regarding the Socialist-Catholic raging anti-Semitism in France, while in Germany Wilhelm Liebknecht whitewashed the domestic anti-Semite leaders, Liebermann von Sonnenberg and others, picturing them as scrupulous men: "That the Jew Dreyfus was sent to Devil's Island simply out of anti-Semitic hatred, is a presumption which clashes with all psychology and common sense . . . No one will suspect me of being an anti-Semite, but as high an opinion as I have of the Jew-hatred of Messrs. Liebermann von Sonnenberg, Boeckel, Ahlwart and their ilk, I would never believe that they, as judges, would be capable of declaring a Jew guilty of a capital crime only because he is a Jew." (Cited by P. W. Massing in *Rehearsal for Destruction)*

No wonder then that the Tsar's 1903-1905 pogrom tactic caused

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

no stir in the anti-Semitic Socialist leadership abroad or at the congresses of the International. The workers were told that anti-Semitism, in a sense, worked for their ultimate interests. We have cited Adler's stand at the Brussels Congress. Afterward, "At the Party Congress in Vienna (1897) Adler was criticised for this. Delegate Brod accused Adler of being extraordinarily careful regarding the anti-Semites. Defending himself against Brod's attacks, Adler . . . at this very Partytag asserted with respect to the activity of the anti-Semites: 'Let the anti-Semites work; in the final analysis they are working for us.' " *(Ev. Enc.,* I, 490). It was really the other way around; in the final analysis the Marxists worked for the bourgeois anti-Semites. The leader and founder of German Social Democracy, Bebel, spread similar perverted ideas: "The reactionaries and chauvinists drive the masses of German workers on against the Jewish capitalists to distract the proletariat from the battle against capitalism as a whole. But this deception will not last very long. The worker incited against the Jewish manufacturer would soon rise against the latter's German colleague and in the sense the anti-Semites are aiding the Social Democrats." *(Anti-Semitismus und Sozialdemokratie.* Cited by A. Goldschmidt in *Whither Israel,* 27). What Bebel overlooked or pretended not to know was that the anti-Semitic drive was not against the Jewish *capitalists* but against *all classes within the Jewish group,* against the *Jews* as a special Scapegoat to divert the masses from struggle against Capitalism.

4. *Engels' Tacit Support to the Anti-Semitism of the Second International and the Bourgeoisie*

Bourgeois thought, discerning anti-Semitism in Marx and Engels but suffering from political indirection and total lack of proper perspective regarding these greatest of all Left anti-Semites, has erroneously concluded that by 1890 Engels reversed himself on the matter of Defamation. (E. Silberner, *Jewish Social Studies,* Oct. 1949). That this conclusion is erroneous can be judged by objective evidence. Having never fully mastered the Social-Democratic double-talk technique regarding the Jews, Engels, several weeks after penning the "Letter to the Unknown Correspondent," once again, now for the last time, kicked the Polish Jews. In a letter to Paul Ernst, dated June 5, 1890, he ridiculed the vast mass of Polish Jewry: "the Polish Jew is a caricature of the Jew." (XXVIII, R. 221; *Sel. Letters,* R. 419). On December 31, 1892, over two and a half years after the letter to the "Unknown Correspondent," Engels, referring to a manufacturer's sale of defective rifles to the German Government, used an anti-Semitic synonym for defective: "In Germany the scandalous story with Baare and with the *Jewish* rifles of Leve." (Letter to Sorge, *Sel. Let.* R. 457. Our Emph.—G. S.). There are signs that Engels' ideology was pervaded with anti-Semitism when he edited the third volume

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of *Capital* in 1893-4, shortly before his death. The volume contains two distinct pieces of Defamation: a footnote by Engels himself in which he tells a "Rothschild" speculation story (551), and a quotation from J. Hardcastle's *Banks and Bankers* which characterizes Jews as "usurers and bloodsuckers." (718)

Unquestionably Engels was informed of the proceedings at the Brussels Congress (Aug. 1891) and saw that his followers, Adler and Singer among them, adopted a fundamentally anti-Jewish position on the issue of anti-Semitism. But he made no official comment. He witnessed the anti-Semitic outbursts of the French Marxists during the Panama Affair (1892-3) and he undoubtedly was familiar with the rejoicing of the German Social Democracy "over the successes of anti-Semitism" and with the official Social Democratic thesis that anti-Semitism "is bound to become revolutionary" but he expressed no criticism. And, most significant, when the anti-Jewish storm began to rage following the arrest of Dreyfus and signs appeared indicating that France might be convulsed with a civil war because of the cry of the "Jewish peril," Engels said not a word.

The Dreyfus Affair originated in the military sphere, a sphere always of special interest to Engels. And just as during the Commune, when "the General" by his official silence sided with the generals who were massacring the workers of Paris, so in the Dreyfus Affair "the General" through his official silence sided with the generals who instituted the anti-Semitic frame-up of Dreyfus.

5. *Additional Light on the Marxist Betrayal of the 1905 Revolution*

We have reviewed the origin and development of anti-Semitism and the scapegoat use of the Jews; we shall now return briefly to the 1905 revolution. The Tsar and the Russian bourgeoisie faced no special difficulty in manipulating anti-Semitism for their political purposes. The Russian bourgeoisie, following its German and French counterparts, retained a special staff of professional anti-Semites, writers who for decades had exhaustively studied the methods of applying the Defamation. These specialists were highly trained, were familiar with foreign languages and had direct access to world literature. They could readily quote any poet, novelist, historian. They knew Spinoza, Fichte, Fourier, Marx, the Bible, the Talmud. Proficient in polemic they operated with great success not only among the backward workers but even among the Left Russian intelligentsia whose Jew-consciousness had been nurtured on the anti-Semitic poison of Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevsky, and other literary celebrities. Gorky attempted to deny that the Russian intellectuals were permeated with the anti-Jewish spirit, but inadvertently admitted it in the very course of his denial: "The intellectual elements of Russian society are not at all infected with the poison of anti-Semitism. Even the commercial and industrial elements in Russia have been little affected by anti-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Semitism. However I must record, to my great sorrow, that the Russian intellectual public still never showed an attitude toward the Jews in accord with the demands of justice." *(About the Jews,* R. 9)

The leading Russian Marxists may not have studied the history of the Jewish group from antiquity to the bourgeois times with the thoroughness of the Shmakovs, but they had a profound knowledge of Russian history. The tragedy of the Jewish Scapegoat in their own country could not have escaped their attention. They may not have known that the first recorded anti-Jewish pogrom occurred in the Fifth Century B.C.E. in Elephantine, Egypt. But the history of Russian anti-Jewish massacres was known to all great students of Russian history. The first anti-Jewish pogrom in Russia took place in the Twelfth Century in Kiev (1113). Ivan the Terrible drove the Jews out of Novgorod and ordered drowning of Jews of Polotsk. Anti-Semitism was employed by the first Romanov, Michael, who, to discredit his rival, the False Demetrius II, branded him as Jewish: "In one of the proclamations about the choice of Michael Theodorovitch to take the throne it was declared that the False Demetrius II was " 'by birth a Zhid.' " (U. Gessen, *The History of Jews in Russia,* R. 10). Alexius Romanov expelled the Jews from Vilno, Mogilev and Moscow. During the reign of Peter the Great, "In 1704 the Ukraine the realm of the Chernigov regiment was in a pogrom tide; many Jews were robbed, driven out, others fell victim to lynch murder by the mob which was inflamed by the rumor that the Jews killed a Christian for ritual purpose." (15). Catherine I on April 26, 1727 ordered that— "The Zhids who live in the Ukraine and other cities are to be put out of Russia beyond the border immediately and are not to be allowed to enter under any circumstances." Thereafter the sadistic persecution of the Scapegoat in Russian Poland and the Ukraine became a part of Russia's national existence. Since 1791 the Tsarist Government maintained a restricted territorial ghetto for the Jews. There were pogroms in Russia in 1849, 1859, and 1871. *(Materiali Dlia Istorii Anti-Evreiskikh Pogromov v Rossii,* II, 111)

The gruesome history of Blood Accusations in Russia prior to the Nineteenth Century was in the records. In 1823 began the sensational Velizh case which lasted for twelve years and which received the personal attention of Nicholas I. Many other Blood Accusations followed. The spark for the 1881 massacres of the Jews was furnished by a Blood Accusation (Report by Cardinal Lorenzo Ganganelli, *The Ritual Murder and the Jew,* 16). Early in the Twentieth Century occurred the most sensational Blood Accusation in Russia thus far: "Of the anti-Jewish 'ritual' cases, the first considerable case attracting universal attention was the Blondes case in Vilno (1900-1902) which coincided with similar cases in Germany and Austria." *(Encyklopedich. Slovar Granat,* XXXVI, Part 2, 599). "No sooner did the social excitement caused by this case (Blondes) die down when a new 'ritual' case burst forth in Dubossar (1903) conducted in a more heavy atmosphere

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

than the Blondes Case. The reaction was growing stronger and despite the fact that the local authorities discovered that the murder was committed by the relatives of the murdered (Christians) on the ground of a property conflict—the Ministry of Justice adopted the point of view of 'ritual' accusation; but since no Jews were found who could with some measure of seeming plausibility be accused of the murder, the Ministry preferred to drop the case against the actual murderers in order thereby to lend credence to the agitation that the murder was committed by Jews. This agitation was the direct prelude to the Kishinev pogrom of 1903." (599-600)

Unquestionably the Marxist leaders knew that the Tsar's agents operated with the Blood Accusation also outside Russia proper: "In 1905 when Russian and Polish workers took up arms to fight for their freedom, Tsar Nicholas II organized special groups, the so-called 'black hundreds' who staged pogroms against the Jews. At the same time the Tsarist police purposely spread rumors in Poland that the Jews were murdering Christian children." *(Jewish Life,* Apr. 1949, 17)

When Plekhanov, speaking of the need to enlighten the masses on the question of anti-Semitism, said "did we do everything we could and ought to have done in this respect? I think we did not."—he left the impression that something had been done but not enough. Were he honest, Plekhanov would have admitted that instead of enlightenment the Party leadership spread confusion and false optimism among the workers. His statement sometime after Kishinev illustrates this fact: "Mssrs. Anti-Semites are *too late. The large centers will no longer follow them.* This explains why the anti-Semitic murderers operate only in *backward regions,* that is in places where the influence of Social-Democratic ideas is not yet strong." *(Iskra,* #50, Oct. 15, 1903). It was well known to Plekhanov, Lenin and other erudite Marxists that the chief centers of anti-Semitic activity in the capitalist world were precisely in those countries where Social-Democracy was the strongest—Germany, France and Austria—while in Russia every industrial district was a hotbed of anti-Semitic progadanda.

In August 1904 the Russian Party presented a report to the Amsterdam Congress of the Second International. The report boasted that the selfdefense organization and the threatening Marxist phrases against the Tsar had thwarted anti-Semitism in Russia: "The rapid retreat of the Government must be ascribed to this organization and also to the categorical announcement that if a pogrom is started despite everything, the organized workers will put up a resolute resistence against it (the need of which *Iskra* indicated immediately after the Kishinev pogrom). Nowhere were there any pogroms, and the Russian proletariat can congratulate itself on the successful fulfillment of that role of guardian of culture and humanity which in Russia, more than anywhere else in the world, fell to the lot of the proletariat." ("About the Jewish Pogrom." From the Report of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Delegates of the Russian Soc. Dem. Labor Party to the Amsterdam International Socialist Congress, R. 43)

These phrases contained two basic elements: falsification, because pogroms had occurred between Kishinev and the Amsterdam Congress; and an opiate which lulled the proletariat, particularly the Jewish workers, into a false sense of security, for a veritable wave of pogroms began immediately after the Congress. Here are dates and places of anti-Jewish pogroms occurring in those two periods. "May 1, 1904 Bender; May 30, Khotin; August 12, Parczev; August 13, Ostrovitz; Sept. 4, Alexandrovo; September 4, Kishinev; Sept. 4, Livinovka; September 4, Ekaterinoslav; September 4, Smiela; September 4, Rovno; September 11, Sosnoviec; October 11, Knyashitza; October 20, Alexandria; October 23, Kanev; October 24, Vitebsk; October 24, Mohilev; October 24, Gorki; October 26, Smolensk; October 26, Lyutsin; October 27, Amtchislav; October 27, Bykhova, Bunitchi, Sielzi, Sukhani, Tchausy, Tcherikov; October 29, Balta; October 31, Juravitch; November 2, Radomysl, Boguslav, Stepenitz, Vilkomir; November 4, Dikoka, Ovidiopol; November 6, Samara; November 16, Slonim; November 18, Ostrov, November 21, Asar; November 22, Elisabetgrad; November 28, Troyanovka; December, Czenstochova, Novoradomsk. (*From Kishinev to Bialostok,* Reprinted from *American Jewish Year Book,* Sep. 1906). The Marxist leaders of the Second International, both at the Amsterdam Congress and after, preferred to overlook the barefaced lies of their Russian colleagues.

Against this bloody background Lenin's criminal policy a few weeks before the decisive October 1905 events is especially striking. Instead of unfolding a campaign of enlightenment on anti-Semitism which was the Tsar's *main* policy against the masses, Lenin diverted the workers' attention to the Tsar's subordinate tactics, such as the local incitement of the Tartars against the Armenians in the Caucasus. At the Conference of Social Democratic Organizations convoked by the Bolsheviks in September 1905 the issue of the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy was ignored and of the two resolutions adopted one dealt with the question of elections to the Duma the other with the Tartar-Armenian situation. The latter read: "The policy of inciting one nationality against the other in the last years has become in the hands of the Government the chief weapon of struggle against the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, and in the recent Caucasian events has reached its apogee in the bloody butchery between Armenians and Tartars." (*Proletari,* Oct. 11, 1905; *Col Wks.* R. VI, 585)

The Tartar-Armenian murders were confined entirely to one corner of the Tsar's huge Empire, the Caucasus. The vast backward Russian masses were not aroused against either group and were not directly involved as in the anti-Jewish campaign. There were no Armenian settlements to attack in Great Russia, Siberia, Belorussia, Lithuania, Poland or the Ukraine. There was no world political move-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ment against the Armenians. The masses in Germany, France, Austro-Hungary and other countries were "Jew-conscious," but they never read about the Armenians preparing to take over a country or the whole world, or being in any way a menace to anybody. While the Tsar *openly* manifested preparations for a nation-wide pogrom to deflect the backward masses from Revolution to an attack on the Jewish Scapegoat, Lenin and his Marxist colleagues fixed the attention of the Social Democratic workers, who had been leading the masses, to the Tartar-Armenian local situation in the Caucasus. And it will bear repetition—when the Tsar's anti-Semitic policy, rendered unassailable by Marxism, broke the back of the Revolution, the Marxists—Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Polish Social Democrats and the Jewish Bundists agreed among themselves at the London Congress to eliminate any explicit attack on the Tsar's specifically *anti-Semitic* policy!

The key to their *conscious* evasion of a struggle on this issue is in Marx's policies and opinions regarding the Jews. When one goes through the writings of Lenin, Plekhanov, Axelrod, Martov, Trotsky, Stalin, Kautsky, Mehring, and virtually all other Marxists one notes that every one of them, in polemics above all, buttressed his positions with direct citations from Marx or, at least, with references to him. Whether the dispute touched upon philosophy, the peasantry, war, the State, or other vital social question, the Marxists first sought an answer in the works of "the Teacher" before venturing their own opinion. It is true that on rare occasions they reversed certain positions of Marx as, for example, Trotsky did on the question of overthrowing the bourgeoisie first in a backward country. But such deviations were exceptions. And most important, in such cases they did not have to conceal or distort Marx's position but claimed that the change represented a further development of Marxism. The question which concerns us here is, What could they find in Marx on the *Jews*? The answer is: *anti-Semitism,* even the instigation of *pogroms!* And the deeper they searched the more of his anti-Semitism they found and the more obvious stood out this aspect of Marx's political character. There is no doubt that the Russian Social Democrats earnestly wanted to overthrow the Tsar. But they realized that if they opened a full scale educational campaign on anti-Semitism, then, instead of achieving the downfall of the House of the Romanovs, they would have brought down upon their own heads the House of Marx.

6. *An Outburst of Marxist Anti-Semitism Before the War of 1914*

On October 11, 1910 France was paralyzed by a railroad strike. The French bourgeoisie was greatly alarmed and the Government acted swiftly. An order was issued mobilizing all reservists into the Army and the strike was broken. Severe reprisals followed. A large number of the most militant railway workers were fired. The French masses were aroused against the Government and the railroad authorities, but the Socialist leaders at once raised the Left anti-Semitic cry:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Rothschild." On January 23, 1911, Mirrens, a Socialist member of the Chamber of Deputies and a close adherent of the Guesde tendency, published a letter in *Le Petit Calaisen,* saying:

"A Jew becomes a sheeny only after he has conscientiously exploited, robbed and cheated the proletariat, the petty traders, small industrialists and small depositors. The millions gotten through such vile means by the scoundrelly and revolting sheeny permit him to seize the press and power . . . In large commerce and industry the sheeny is stronger than the Christian capitalists . . . The sheeny's influence over journalism explains the harsh abuse which the lackeys of the Radical press are pouring out against the clergy and followers of the Christian religion while they don't say a single word against other religions, clergymen and followers.

"The sheeny dragged the proletariat into the case (Dreyfus) because the Jew who mixed up in it was very rich and had family connections with eminent aliens whose patriotism represents nothing but the arrogance of a 'barbarian' conquering a country.

"On the other hand, toward the railroad workers the sheeny was merciless, he revealed his stony heart, the impudence of an upstart, his contempt for the services rendered." (Quoted by U. Steklov, in *The Last Word in French Anti-Semitism,* R. 37-39)

The reader probably is curious to know what action the Socialist Party took against this outspoken Marxist anti-Semite. The answer is—*none!* Steklov records: "We shall also add that the letter resulted in no repercussions for the author; the Party not only did not expel him from its midst, not only did not at least call him to account but even paid no attention to him whatsoever; neither at the Party Congress nor in the Party press was any exception taken to this letter. It was enthusiastically reprinted only by *Oeuvre,* by the Anarchist Janvioi in his *Terre Libre* and by Victor Merrick in *Les Hommes du Jour.*" (39)

Steklov indicates that Mirrens should have been expelled. But if there ever was a member expelled from a Marxist organization for anti-Semitism we have never come upon the records. If elimination of anti-Semitic elements from Marxist organizations has been the politics of Marxism, the first three slated for expulsion from the First International would have been Marx, Engels and Bakunin. But there are instances of self-declared anti-Semites being accepted into the First, Second and Communist Internationals and staying in them for a longer or shorter period of time. Merrick, for example, was a member of the French Socialist Party. In 1911 he publicly exhibited his personal Left pogromist sentiments in *Les Hommes du Jour:*

"I, a *Socialist revolutionary,* firmly intend to attack the Jews whenever I see fit." (Cited by Steklov, 42)

Merrick stayed on in the Second International until the Tours Congress of the French Socialist Party in 1920. When the majority

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

split off and went over to the Bolsheviks he went with it and was accepted into the Comintern. (45)

Jaures joined his Socialist colleagues in diverting the French workers from struggle against the capitalist class as a whole by inciting them against the *Jewish* capitalists. During the debate in the Chamber on the issue of the discharged railroad strikers, he declared: "We have never resorted and never will resort to the savage baseness of anti-Semitism, *but* I have a right to say that if at present the big bankers of whom I am speaking hold the lives and subsistence of 500 families in their hands, then twelve years ago the lives and social position of all the rich Jews was in the hands of the proletariat. Had the proletariat entered into a conspiracy with the stormy passions of that time against the rich Jews, then they and their wealth would have been swept away like a leaf by the wind." *(Chambre des Deputes, Debats Parlementaires Compte Rendu, Decembre,* 1910, 3526. Cited by Steklov, 33. Our emph.—G. S.)

7. *The Lenin-Trotsky Leadership Honors French Socialist Anti-Semitism*

Lenin never criticised anti-Semitism in the Russian or in the international Social Democracy. He never commented on Alexinsky's "joke" about staging an anti-Jewish pogrom in the Party nor did he ever condemn Stalin's giving public currency to it. The Bolshevik leadership was silent when a member of its faction, Liadov, nearly caused a riot at a meeting of Russian and Jewish emigrant workers in Berlin in 1904 by his anti-Semitic remark: "I consider that the calling of a citizen is higher than that of a Jew." (M. Liadov, *From the Life of the Party On the Eve and in the Years of the First Revolution,* R. 18). Lenin was familiar with Jaures' politics and often singled out the pacifist and opportunist sides of the anti-Semitic leader of the Right Wing of the French Socialist Party for attack. When the Tsar formed a tripartite Entente Cordiale with the British and French imperialists (August 18, 1907) designed as a move toward war against Germany, Jaures rapturously backed this war alliance. In 1908 Lenin severely attacked him: "To what lengths opportunism is capable of going in these questions too is shown by the recent utterance of Jaures. In expressing his views on the international situation in an obscure German liberal bourgeois newspaper, he defends the alliance of France and England with Russia against the accusation of anti-pacific intentions and considers this alliance to be a 'guarantee of peace.' " *(Sel. Wks.* IV, 332). In *Against the Current,* Zinoviev stated on August 23, 1915: "Didn't the entire Jauresism and Jaures himself defend in the International precisely this social-pacifism? And does anyone doubt that if the bullet of the assassin had not sent the French orator to the grave he would be sitting now in the ministry and together with his entire Socialist Party would be defending social-chauvinism?" (R. 121). In sum, according to the evaluation presented

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

by the Bolshevik leadership, Jaures was a social-imperialist, an enemy of the working class. This, however, did not prevent Lenin from approving the resolution on Jaures sponsored by the Rights, including the Jewish Bund, at the Zimmerwald Conference in 1915. He printed it in his journal: "The conference honors the memory of the great Socialist *Jean Jaures* who has become the first victim of the present war, martyr and fighter against chauvinism." *(Social-Demokrat,* Oct. 11, 1915; Lenin, *Documents and Materials,* XVIII, R. 415)

Plekhanov, who in this period was supporting the Tsar, wrote in the same vein as Lenin. "The memory of Jaures is dear to us." *(Svobodnoe Slovo,* New York, August 1916, 625)

In January 1917 the Bolshevik leadership again changed its line on Jaures: "The most talanted among the Socialist opportunists, Jaures, who vividly synthesized in his person the bourgeois and 'Socialist' pacifism." *(Against the Current,* 386)

After the Bolsheviks established the Sovnarkom regime, the French Social Democratic Marxists decided to erect a monument to Jaures. Once more the Bolshevik leaders changed the line on Juares. Hoping that the practical people among their French cousins would be in favor of de jure recognition of the Sovnarkom regime, Trotsky in an article captioned "En Route: Thoughts on the Progress of the Proletarian Revolution" lied as follows: "Jaures, an ardent defender of the interests of the proletariat and profoundly devoted to Socialism, came out, as a tribune of a democratic nation, against imperialism." *(Izvesia,* April 29, 1919). Concrete action followed these hypocritical words. The French Social Democrats were collecting money for a monument to Jaures. Through the French section of the Comintern they received a sizable contribution from the Bolshevik leadership:

"The Executive Committee of the Communist International has contributed fifty thousand francs for the monument to Jaures in Paris. The money will be transferred through the Communist Party of France." *(Petrogradskaya Pravda,* Sept. 5, 1919)

The Stalin disciples of Lenin have carried on the lies and hypocrisy of their teacher: "Jean Jaures belonged, without any doubt, to the few men who deserve the name of leaders of the working class." *(Kalendar Kommunista na 1924,* 477)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER IX.

THE LENIN-CAUSED "BREST" POGROMS

1. *The Tsar's Anti-Semitic Policy in the 1914 War and the Lackey Role of the Jewish Bourgeoisie*

WHEN THE war of 1914 broke out, the Jews of the various European countries involved in the conflict rallied to the support of their respective governments. The Jewish bourgeoisie in Russia criminally pretended to have forgotten the recent pogroms (1903-1907) and the more recent notorious Blood Accusation Beilis Case (1911-1913), and rallied to the support of the Tsar:

"Our dear fatherland—great Russia—has been challenged to a terrible, bloody battle . . . And our brothers in faith, the Jews, throughout the entire expanse of the Russian Empire have come up readily to fulfil their citizens' duty, and many have volunteered for the ranks of the Army that proceeded to the battlefields." *(Novi Voskhod,* #11; Cited in Report on the Jewish Questions by the Central Committee of the Party of People's Freedom (K. D.) at the Conference, June, 1915)

The Tsar replied to this crawling policy with a pogrom in Suvalki in September 1914. As the war proceeded to unfold, the number of pogroms and the persecution of the Jews increased. "The first World War brought unspeakable miseries to the 2,000,000 Jews in Poland. Suspected of sympathy for the Central Powers, they suffered severely from the Russian troops. Many Jews were shot as spies under martial law, rabbis and prominent Jews were held as hostages, and numerous communities were evacuated, so that more than 80,000 fugitives fled to Warsaw. The lot of the Jews grew worse and worse as Poland became the scene of the fighting." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* VIII, 573). "All the previous methods were employed and were directed toward reducing the meaning of the patriotic upsurge in the Jewish population. A tale was spread that the Jews were peddling their patriotism and were willing to give it only in exchange for immediate grant of equal rights." (Rep. on Jewish Q. June 1915)

Back in 1903-1907 the Tsar had used the Jewish Scapegoat to divert the Russian masses from the overthrow of the autocracy. The Revolution had been explained as a Jewish plot to enslave Russia. But during the War of 1914 the Tsar utilized anti-Semitism as part of the win-the-war program to whip up Russian chauvinism, and when military defeats ensued, his agents blamed them on the Jews. The Jewish bourgeoisie, however, both in Russia and in countries allied with the Tsar, gave him support to the last day of his power.

2. *The Overthrow of the Tsar; the Proletarian Vanguard Safeguards the Jewish Scapegoat*

Gradually the Russian masses lost all interest in winning the War, they became opposed to the War and therefore were in conflict with the entire policy of the Tsar and the Russian bourgeoisie. And since

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

anti-Semitism in this period was aimed not at diverting the masses from revolution but at keeping them tied to the war policy of the bourgeoisie, the autocracy, officially representing this policy, was left utterly unprotected against a successful uprising.

The Black Hundreds, in disorder, made frantic efforts to reorient their anti-Semitic agitation from the military to the social question. But the Soviets of workers, soldiers and sailors crushed these efforts.

"The first reports about anti-Semitic outbreaks after the revolution came from the Kiev and Poltava gubernias. In the beginning of March in the pages of the *Izvestia* of the Poltava Soviet of Workers and Soldiers Deputies (#7, 1917) appeared the first news about the pogrom agitation of the Black Hundred elements of Poltava . . . In Brusilov there was even an attempt—for the first time after the revolution—to start a pogrom, but the robbing of Jewish shops was immediately stopped by the militia . . . In view of the pogrom agitation in Balta in March, the Soviet of Soldiers Deputies sent a hundred soldiers there with machine guns. In Tiraspol an attempt to organize a pogrom was uncovered: in an attic of a house a ritual murder was dramatized, and leaflets calling for a pogrom were plastered over the city. From a number of towns came reports about an intense Black Hundred agitation on the basis of the high cost of living and the difficulty in obtaining food: in Zhitomir a crowd of women searched Jewish homes for food; in Elisavetgrad a crowd opened several dozen Jewish graves, seeking food supplies." (Cherikover, *Anti-Semitism i Pogromi na Ukraine*, 1917-1918, 30-31)

"Reports of unsuccessful attempts by the Black Hundreds, after the abdication of the Czar, to foment anti-Jewish riots at Kishinev, Odessa, Olviopol, Ekaterinburg and Moghilev . . . Kiev: unsuccessful attempts to start anti-Jewish pogroms in several places in the province result in arrest of ringleader, an ex-police official. Tsaritsin, Baku, Revel, Bogorodsk and Eerguisk (near Tula): attempted pogroms by Real Russians and police suppressed by soldiers and workmen . . . Kremenchug, Rostov, Tsaritsin and Feodosia: attempt of Real Russians to provoke anti-Jewish pogroms frustrated by Committees of Soldiers and Workmen. Bender: Anti-Jewish rioting having occurred, companies of soldiers and sailors from Odessa restore order . . . Tsaritsin: Army interferes in plans of Black Hundreds who plan Jewish massacre. Sergeifski, Tulas: Army interferes with pogrom organized by police . . . Brusilov (near Kiev): Militia disperses Black Hundreds who organize anti-Jewish riot." *(American Jewish Year Book*, 1917-1918, 306-309)

While within Russia incipient pogrom acts were stopped dead, in the military field the pogrom policy of the Tsar was successfully continued under Kerensky in areas untouched by the Revolution. During the Kerensky offensive in the summer of 1917, the city of Kalush, seized by his generals from the Austrian Army, was subjected to a frightful pogrom. "The pogrom was participated in by 'the better

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

class of troops, the least depraved by the revolution'—those carefully picked for the offensive. But what still more clearly shows its face in this affair is the leadership of the offensive—the old tsarist commanders, experienced organizers of pogroms." (Trotsky, *H. of R.R.* I, 387)

The Mensheviks and SRs, who controlled the Soviets and factually ruled the country prior to October, permitted the Black Hundred press to carry on its pogrom agitation. The excuse was "freedom of the press." However the Soviet masses crushed all major physical manifestations of anti-Semitism. For the first time in the history of mankind since the Diaspora the Jewish Scapegoat found sincere and real protection from the advanced workers, sailors and soldiers.

3. *Upsurge of Anti-Semitism After the July Days*

In July 1917 the Mensheviks and SRs aided the Kerensky regime to crush the vanguard masses misled by the Bolshevik burocrats. The result was a rise of the influence of the Black Hundreds. A tactic was introduced to split the Soviets along anti-Jewish lines: "Proclamations were scattered last week throughout Petrograd, containing libelous insults against the Jewish members of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Committee and demanding their immediate dismissal." *(Jewish Exponent,* Sept. 19, 1917). The Jewish bourgeois press further reported:

"Strong Wave of Anti-Semitism in Russia . . . At a meeting of soldiers in Petrograd, all speakers came out boldly for the removal of the 'foreign' elements from the Committee of Soldiers and Workmen's Delegates. By 'foreign' as is understood are meant the Jews. The Provisional government was also attacked for the appointment of M. Gurewitch as assistant to the Minister of the Interior. The assistant minister, Zarudny, just made public the fact that a delegation of workmen recently called on Premier Kerensky and declared to him that the Jewish members of the Committee of Soldiers should receive adequate punishment for the meddling in the affairs of the government." *(Ib.,* Sept. 21, 1917)

The Bolshevik records indicate that the Army before October was in danger of decomposing along anti-Semitic lines: "The pogrom movement is notably growing and is assuming an organized character on the territory of Eleventh division, Seventh Army . . . soldiers of this very Army staged a Jewish pogrom in the region of the divisional staff; the pogrom was stopped with the aid of the machine gun unit." ("Decomposition of the Army in 1917," Tsentroarkhiv, *1917 in Documents and Materials,* R. 145). "Great discontent is caused by the shortage of supplies, the reduction of bread rations, issuance of fish, lack of tobacco, immeasurable dearth at the nearest trade points of the Army rear, especially the lack and dearth of tobacco products. On this ground anti-Semitic propaganda scores success. Calls to pogroms are observed in a whole number of places." (151)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

4. *Jewish Blood Payment for Lenin's Brest Policy*

Lenin's assumption of power appeared to be a bright portent for the Jews. To create the feeling that his policies would safeguard the Jewish population against the pogromists he instructed all Soviets to prevent pogroms. The resolution on this instruction was introduced by Kamenev and adopted unanimously and without debate by all the Marxist factions at the Second Congress of Soviets.

Three days later Lenin issued a decree suppressing the Black Hundred and the Kadet press. Everything seemed to indicate that the safety of the Jews was infinitely more secure than before October. Then Lenin launched his Brest policy. For the Jewish population the termination of Fraternization, the interminable talk of Trotsky, and the soldiers' ignorance of the nature of anti-Semitism spelled the beginning of a monstrous period. "The starving soldiers who were deserting the front plundered Jewish settlements on their way. In some places there were excesses on the part of the Ukrainian peasants, but these were merely isolated cases." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* VIII, 561)

We remember that it was the Brest policy which allowed the Russian bourgeoisie to begin a large-scale civil war. And it was only within the context of the Civil War that an unprecedented anti-Jewish terror unfolded. "It was only after the seizure of control by the Bolsheviks and during the civil war that ensued that a horrible wave of pogroms passed over the country, from which the Jews of the Ukraine were the greatest sufferers." *(Ib.)*

On the day after the Right-Marxist Vinnichenko-Petlura Government had been constituted in the Ukraine, the question of the spreading pogroms was officially brought up by Jewish bourgeois deputies in the Ukrainian parliament: "On the 28 of November 1917 I. Shechtman of the Zionist fraction entered the first interpellation into the Malaya Rada about the pogrom excesses . . . 'The horror of the situation is aggravated by the fact that the entire able-bodied adult Jewish male population is in the Army. There is no one left to resist the pogromists; there have remained only old men, children and helpless women . . .' On December 19, 1917 for the second time two interpellations regarding pogroms were presented in the Rada by N. Sirkin in the name of the Zionist fraction and by D. Lipets in the name of the Bund. D. Lipets pointed out that 'the wave of pogroms in the Ukraine not only does not subside but is steadily rising.' " (Cherikover, 53)

With a Right-Marxist governmental cover, the whole Ukrainian bourgeoisie went over to anti-Semitic activity, as indicated in an investigation by a French Jewish bourgeois body: "But the situation became worse when, about December, 1917, to January, 1918, a new factor appeared for the first time: a wholesale spread of anti-Semitism among the leading and influential Ukrainians." (Comite Des Delegations Juives, Paris, *The Pogroms in the Ukraine,* 11)

In quick succession the Bolsheviks captured a good part of the Ukraine and set up a Bolshevik Ukrainian regime with the capital at

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Kharkov (Dec. 27, 1917), occupied Kiev, and the Rada fled to Zhitomir (Feb. 9, 1918). But with the Hoffmann advance along the Russian Front Lenin decided to turn over the Ukraine to the Kaiser as a price for "peace." The Vinnichenko regime returned to Kiev (March 1, 1918) and with the signing of the Brest Treaty Lenin ordered Antonov-Ovseenko to carry out the demobilization of the October Army in the Ukraine.

At the Seventh Congress of the Bolshevik Party (March 6, 1918), where the word *betrayal* was freely spoken, not a single "critic" of Lenin's Brest policy raised the question of what would now happen to the large Jewish population in the Ukraine. In the face of the rapidly rising pogrom tide, the Bolshevik chiefs, who had clearly shown at the Second Congress of the Soviets four months before that they were fully aware of the danger of the Jewish massacres, now pretended not to see it. All the Bolshevik tendencies—Lenin's, Trotsky's and Bukharin's—maintained significant silence on the obvious threat of massacres of Jews. When the Troitks Soviet on the eve of Lenin's betrayal of the oppressed in the Ukraine declared "To agree to give the Ukraine to the bourgeois Rada . . . is to abandon them to be tortured by the bourgeoisie" *(Izvestia,* March 3, 1918), the Jews, who were to be the chief victim in the Ukraine, were not even mentioned. To secure "peace" with the Kaiser, Lenin consciously turned over the Jewish population of the Ukraine to the Vinnichenko-Petlura Rada pogromists.

After the Seventh Bolshevik Congress, for nearly three years, the Jews of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Poland and Great Russia paid a tremendous toll in blood and suffering for Lenin's Brest policy, a toll heavier than those paid by the Jews for the Crusades, for the Black Death and in all the Tsarist pogroms since the founding of the Romanov Dynasty. "Suffice it to name a few figures to become aware of the incredible horrors perpetrated on the Jewish masses during the Civil War. From 1918 to 1921 the Denikinites, Petlurovites, White Poles, Bulak-Bulakovich, Makhnovites and other bandits organized 1,520 pogroms of an almost exclusively military character. In these pogroms between 180,000 and 200,000 Jews were brutally tortured to death and murdered. The number of orphans alone exceeded 300,000—at the time a mass of Jewish children was killed. In many places a series of towns inhabited by Jews were wiped off the face of the earth." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXIV, 148). In addition to the murdered and orphaned there were almost three-quarters of a million Jews maimed during the Brest-made pogroms. *(Jews in the U.S.S.R. a Symposium,* by Kalinin and others, 19). Of the 2,500,000 Jews in the territories subjected to pogroms, half were directly affected. "The burying societies could have given information about the numbers of those buried in the cemeteries, but not about those who were drowned, burned, thrown into wells, buried in the fields and forests. Relatives could have given information about members lost without a trace.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

But who would gather all these relatives and who will conduct an inquiry. And, besides, how often were whole families butchered without any member left alive?" (Gusev-Orenburgsky, *A Gory Book,* R. 15)

The Jewish Scapegoat was tormented to a greater or lesser degree by every force, including the German occupation authorities.

Because the Bolsheviks pursued the traditional Marxist policy of playing down the issue of anti-Semitism, the millions recruited into the Sovnarkom's Army were in one degree or another infected with this virus. Many of the former Tsarist officers serving in the Red Army were confirmed anti-Semites. This held true for some Bolshevik commissars. A Bolshevik writer S. Agursky, testifies: "Anti-Semitism penetrated even into certain Soviet institutions to perform its misanthropic work. It reached such a point that in a small town, Kirsanov, the Extraordinary Commission for Struggle Against Counter-Revolution [Cheka—G. S.] posted an announcement that not a single Jew had the right to leave town without the permission of the Cheka. A similar event took place in Kursk. There one commissar spread a rumor that during a forced retreat of the Red Army units and the advance of counter-revolutionary bands upon Kursk, the Jewish Selfdefense fired upon the retreating Red units. When this rumor reached Moscow, the Jewish Commissariat dispatched a representative to investigate the incident, and it became known that the whole story was sheer invention: there was no Jewish Self-defense in Kursk. The aim of this calumny was to arouse the Red Army men against the Jews." *(Jewish Worker in the Communist Movement,* R. 151-2)

Occasionally a Red Army unit commanded by some petty anti-Semitic officers would attack the Jews as "counter-revolutionists." The Jewish bourgeois paper *Razsvet* in Petrograd reported such an event in Suraj: "Here arrived a unit of the Red Army of the 'First Lenin Regiment' 'to punish counter-revolutionists.' It staged a pogrom of Jewish houses. The Commander of the Red Unit who came to stop the pogrom publicly asserted that 'the Jews in other places welcomed the Germans.' " (Cited by Cherikover, 145)

The Lenin-Trotsky leadership realized that the pogrom movement of the bourgeoisie was really aimed at the Bolshevik regime. It was in the Sovnarkom's direct interest to counteract the anti-Jewish epidemic which also affected the Red Army. In June 1918 the Bolshevik leadership issued a decree "against" anti-Semitism. However, *politically* the Bolshevik Marxists had to conceal their own historical support to anti-Semitism, conceal the outbreaks of anti-Semitism in the Marxist movement, in their own Red Army and continue avoiding ideological enlightenment on the subject. The substitute for an honest policy was "protest" meetings at which the speakers traditionally confused the historical Scapegoat with locally-oppressed national and racial groups, and made empty promises to conduct an educational campaign of exposure of anti-Semitism.

The Bolshevik false explanation of anti-Semitism added immeas-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

urably to the confusion of the workers on this issue. A sample of such explanations is Lenin's brief speech "The Pogroms Against the Jews" in 1919, later included in a pamphlet *Lenin on the Jewish Question.* In this speech he stated: "Enmity against the Jews can only exist where the landowners and capitalists have kept the workers and peasants in complete illiteracy." This was a deliberate falsehood for Lenin knew very well that enmity against the Jews were rampant in highly advanced countries, France and Germany, and had prevailed in such enlightened homes as those of Marx and Engels in England. On the other hand, there was no hatred of Jews in China or India where the masses were kept in illiteracy. Lenin's most deceiving assertion regarding anti-Semitic accusations was: "But these dark survivals of serfdom are disappearing, the people are beginning to see." Nobody was beginning to see insofar as the people was concerned—thanks to the mis-education disseminated by the Bolshevik and anti-Bolshevik Marxists and the bourgeoisie. And it was due to this deliberate miseducation that anti-Semitic agitation continued to infect the Russian masses with signal success, spreading among both the White and Red forces. An illusration of infected ideology of a Russian boy serving with a Bolshevik military expedition can be found in a work by a "Soviet" writer: "Here is a letter home, dictated to me by a boy of our expedition. It deserves not to be forgotten. I record it without embellishment and transmit it literally in accord with truth. 'Dear mother . . . What have we seen in Maikop? We have seen that the rear does not sympathize with the Front, that there is treason everywhere and there are many Zhids just like under the old regime.'" (I. Babel, *Konarmia,* "Pismo," 12, 13)

Because Babel's work was printed by the Bolshevik State without an appropriate enlightening note on anti-Semitism, this work itself became a purveyor of the poison.

The Jewish population paid in blood also for the prestige—intrigues in the power-greedy upper circles of the Bolshevik burocracy. Elsewhere we have discussed the intrigue involving the topmost Bolshevik burocrats in connection with General S. S. Kamenev's "plan." Trotsky, as we recall, understood that the "plan" was false but he put it into effect to prove his own correctness in having opposed it. In playing his burocratic game Trotsky of course knew full well that it would be the Jews, even more than the Ukrainian revolutionary workers and peasants, who would entail most unspeakable terror and death.

Taking advantage of the internal Bolshevik intrigues and of Lenin's Brest policy in general, the Russian, Ukrainian and Polish bourgeoisie inflicted tortures on the Jewish Scapegoat the likes of which had never been witnessed in the most savage butcheries of the Jews in the Middle Ages. "As to the methods of physical torture, it is necessary to point out that in the first place, the most common applied by the Denikinites was the burning of the most delicate parts

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the body, next was the example-hanging by removing the victims time and again from the noose. The next method was slow strangling with a rope, the cutting off of separate limbs and organs, gouging the eyes . . . Finally the Petlurovites and bandits practiced drownings in rivers and wells, burning and burying alive. To the methods of torture must be added the mass violations of women, mostly the young and baby girls. All this was cynically perpetrated before the parents and closest relatives. The unfortunate victims would pass from one pogromist to the other and not infrequently would die right there. Those who survived the ordeal were usually infected with the most foul venereal diseases and often ended up with suicide." (*Jewish Pogroms,* 1918-1921, Moscow, 1926, 6; E. Gorev, *Against Anti-Semites,* R. 111). Gusev-Orenburgsky's *Gory Book* is one of the most gruesome of records. Typical of the Jewish horrors was a little town, Ladizhenka: "Peker and his wife lay in their house, he with his head cut off and she with her belly ripped open. Between the father and mother lay, still alive, suffocating, two small children, age two and three. Wednesday the buriers collected six hundred and nine corpses and numerous human limbs, heads, hands, feet, and also indeterminate scraps of flesh. They got together the corpses of 25 women—girls and married—who had been torn to pieces in the full sense of the word." (29)

And this was but one small town among many in this pogrom nightmare brought on by Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and other Marxist bandits of personal power!

The Comite Des Delegations Juives collected a great deal of information on the bestial tortures of the Jewish Scapegoat in the Ukraine. "Reports on the pogroms of this period abound in terrible details such as: cutting out the tongue, putting out eyes and forcing parents or relatives to see it done . . . An infant was taken from its mother's breast, and its head was cut off under her eyes . . . At Bratslav some Jews were hanged by their hands and pieces of their bodies were chopped off by sabres, others were roasted . . . A young man, aged 22, A. Spector, was killed under the eyes of his father and the old man was compelled to lick the blood of his dead son, to kiss the boots of his torturers, to sing and to dance." (87, 88, 89)

Such were the Lenin-caused pogroms!

One of the most frightful tortures to which those who survived a pogrom were subjected was a "torture by fear" in the bourgeois-occupied Ukraine. Shulgin, editor of the Black Hundred paper *Kievlianin,* with zest described the torture of the 100,000 Jews in Kiev:

"*Torture by Fear.* In the night upon the streets of Kiev descends medieval horror. Amidst dead silence and deserted streets there suddenly begin heartrending wails. It is the 'zhids' yelling. They are yelling from fear. In the darkness of the street appears a little group of 'people with bayonets' and, espying them, the large five-storied and six-storied buildings begin to howl from top to bottom. Entire streets, seized with mortal terror, cry out with voices that are not human, in

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

fear of death. It is terrible to hear these voices of the post-revolutionary night. Of course, this fear is exaggerated and, from our point of view, assumes senseless and debasing forms. Yet it is authentic horror, a real 'torture by fear' to which the entire Jewish population is subjected... As to the Russian population, it listens to these terrible wailings produced by the 'torture by fear' and thinks its own thoughts. It is thinking: will the Jews learn anything during these awful nights. Will they understand what it means to destroy States which they did not create? Will they understand what it means to secure equal rights no matter at what price? Will they understand what it means to incite, upon the recipe of the 'great teacher' Karl Marx, one class against another?...

"Before the Jews lie two paths. One, to admit everything and repent. The other to deny, to blame everybody except themselves. Their fate will depend on their choice of the path. Is it possible that even the 'torture of fear' will not point out to them the right path?" (*Kievlianin*, Oct. 8, 1919; cited by V. V. Shulgin in *What We Dislike in Them*, R. 99-100)

5. *The Anti-Bolshevik Marxists, the Jewish Bourgeoisie and the Pogrom Regimes*

The first pogromist Ukrainian People's Republic was a Left bourgeois democratic regime directed by a General Secretariat composed largely of anti-Bolshevik Marxists, Gentiles and Jews. "The General Secretariat as constituted included the following members: President, Vinnichenko (Social Democrat); War, Petlura (Social-Democrat); Labor, Porsh (Social-Democrat); Foreign Affairs, Shulgin (Socialist-Federalist) (not the Shulgin of the *Kievlianin*—G. S.); Post and Telegraph, Zarubin (Socialist-Revolutionist); State Comptroller, Zolotarev (Bund); and three ministers of nationalities, Zilberfarb (Jewish Socialist); Mickiewicz (Polish Democrat), and Odinets (Socialist-Populist)." (Bunyan and Fisher, *The Bolshevik Rev.* 437-8). The Petlura Left pogromists, replaced by the German command with a Right pogromist Skoropadsky, returned to power after the collapse of the German Empire. To remove any doubt that Petlura, the factual dictator in the regime, was a pogromist, we shall cite his Socialist comrade-in-power: "S. Petlura had been called in the press a 'pogrom man,' and truth compels one to admit that he really deserved this grim appellation." (Vinnichenko, *The Rebirth of a Nation*, III, 367). Even more conclusive was the outcome of the trial of Petlura's assassin in Paris where the arch-pogromist found sanctuary after the Civil War in Russia: "According to the documents in the Ost Judische Historische Archive in Berlin, it is evident that Petlura personally instigated and supported the massacre of thousands of Jews in Ukraine and Poland. Petlura was shot by Samuel Schwartzbard, a Jewish watchmaker, on May 26, 1926, in Paris. Schwartzbard was acquitted on the basis of Petlura's atrocities." (*Univ. Jewish Enc.* VIII, 471)

The Ukrainian anti-Bolshevik Jewish Marxists as well as the Jew-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ish bourgeoisie backed Petlura politically and cooperated with him in giving his pogromist regime a democratic aura. On August 26, 1919, in his hypocritical order "condemning" pogroms, Petlura testified: "The best Jewish parties, like the 'Bund,' 'The United Party,' 'The Poalei-Zion,' 'The Volkspartei' have resolutely ranged themselves on the side of the Independent Ukrainian State and are working for it hand-in-hand with us." (Comite Des Delegations Juives, 215)

The 400,000 Jewish soldiers, mobilized into the Army before the overthrow of the Tsar, remembered the numerous pogroms of the Tsarist days and, viewing with alarm the rising anti-Semitic incitement and actual attempts of massacres, formed a Union of Jewish Soldiers to establish an adequate self-defense: "The question of armed self-defense arose especially sharply after the October overthrow, when the 'masses tore themselves from supervision' as stated in the materials of the Union. The tide of excesses was spreading wider and wider, and the talk about organizing Jewish detachments was resumed but this time more concretely. Thus, at the general meeting of the Jewish soldiers of the 19 Infantry Division stationed in Novoseliti a resolution was adopted, declaring: 'We, Jews, soldiers of the trenches, demand of both the Central Rada and the central Russian power that they organize from the Army units in the rear battalions composed of Jewish soldiers and other nationalities sympathetic to the idea of protecting the defenseless Jewish masses against pogroms.' " (Cited by Cherikover, 87)

Both the Bolshevik and the Petlura regimes disregarded the plea because they were engaged in building their own national forces. Besides, insofar as Petlura was concerned military selfdefense would have interfered with his pogrom policy. An outspoken opposition to selfdefense was presented by the Ukrainian anti-Bolshevik Jewish Marxists: "The paper *Naie Zait* wrote: 'Among the Jewish soldiers the slogan has spread, therefore, to form Jewish battalions, regiments and divisions, and then (the soldiers say) we won't be kicked around from the Ukranians to the Russians and back again, but the main thing is that we shall be able with our own forces to fight against the pogroms.' But, the paper argues, reflecting the view of the Left parties, 'this will bring more harm than good because it will create great friction between the Jewish soldiers and the non-Jewish and general population.' The representatives of the Left tendencies stood on the position that the pogroms were not a Jewish calamity alone and therefore the entire democracy must struggle against them and there was no room here for a specifically Jewish selfdefense." (91)

Fundamentally, as we have shown in connection with 1905, the idea of Jewish Selfdefense was not correct politically and was born only as a result of the fact that Marxism as well as the "entire democracy" stood directly or indirectly on anti-Semitic grounds. But the *Naie Zait* did not indicate this fact.

Naturally, many Jewish soldiers, seeing no hope for a real defense

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Jews by either the Bolshevik or the anti-Bolshevik Marxists or the bourgeois democrats of all national colors, formed a number of detachments and stopped pogroms in a number of localities (93-94). However, these detachments were either disarmed by the German command (94), or were dispersed in the general demobilization and de-composition of the October Army. Many of the Jewish soldiers supported or were members of the Marxist Bund. The Bund leaders offered their services to Petlura as recruiting sergeants among the Jewish population. But the irony of the situation was that Petlura's pogrom policy was based on the propaganda that the Jews were agents of Bolshevism, so he kept them out of his Army: "Thus Mr. Rafes stated that at Korostyshev, in Volhynia, the entire organized 'Bund' presented itself on mobilization but was not accepted . . . it is of interest to quote the conclusion arrived at by the committee of inquiry appointed by order of Colonel Oskilko, Commander-in-Chief of the Seventh Western Front: 'Commanding officers of the armies of the Directory or officers acting on their behalf very frequently refused to admit Jews to the Army (at Tcherniakhov Jews were not accepted even after the mobilization order), while members of the Directory at the same time charged and taunted the Jews with not entering the Army.' " (Comite, 53)

The Ukrainian anti-Bolshevik Marxists made a pretense of opposition to anti-Semitism while giving left-handed support to it. Some expressed themselves openly against the Jews: "A. W. Nikovsky, editor of *Nova Rada,* the oldest Ukrainian newspaper and the organ of the Ukrainian Socialist-federalists, wrote an article signed with his full name, entitled, 'The Jews and the Ukrainian Army,' which in substance levelled the same accusations against the Jews that were made against them by those who incited the Haidamaks to commit pogroms." (15). "A pamphlet, 'Concerning Jewish Socialist Youth and Jewish Workmen' by G. Sogobotchny, a Ukrainian Social-Democrat, was also published about the same time, containing wholesale charges without foundation. Thus anti-Semitism spread to quarters which until then had been considered perfectly immune against the poison, and which now in their turn poisoned the masses . . . Thus passions were inflamed and pogroms and individual acts of violence against Jews reached unheard-of proportions." (16)

The terrorized and despised Ukrainian Jewish bourgeoisie crawled before Petlura. Its representative, P. Krasny, was in Petlura's Cabinet in the capacity of Minister for Jewish Affairs. The Jewish "affairs" consisted of wholesale slaughter and rape, and Krasny did the "investigating" after a tidal wave of horror would pass over a Jewish community. (226-7). He would absolve Petlura and organize relief and medical aid for the survivors.

Petlura had Jewish bourgeois representatives abroad, intellectual prostitutes and self-seekers who, for the sake of the personal "prestige" attached to their positions, shielded him from being exposed as a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

satanic butcher of the Jews. One of these creatures, Julian Batchinsky, issued a letter "The Ukrainian Government not criminally negligent." The letter was printed in October and November 1919 in the *New York Hebrew Standard,* in the *St. Louis Jewish Voice,* in the *New Orleans Jewish Ledger,* in the *Jewish Monitor* of Fort Worth, Texas, *Jewish Advocate* of Boston, and in a number of non-Jewish papers—such as the *New York Evening Post,* the *New York Globe.*

Thus the Jewish Scapegoat was kept in the dark by the Jewish supporters of Petlura. Petlura's Jewish representative in London, Dr. Arnold Margolin, wrote as follows: "The Ukrainian Government has steadfastly set its face against the pogroms, and it has had no part in, or responsibility for them." (Batchinsky, Margolin, Vishnitzer, Zangwill, *Jewish Pogrom in Ukraine,* 19). Among those who issued the above-cited pamphlet we note the name of Dr. Mark Vishnitzer, Jewish historian and editor of the *Jewish Encyclopedia* and author of the *History of the Jewish People.* (21). Here is what he stated about the "Jewish Question" in the Ukraine under the pogrom government: "Thus the Jewish Question, which has been worrying most European countries, was solved in a clear and natural way . . . Owing to the political conditions the law has not yet taken effect, but during the two years the independent Ukrainian state has existed public life has been able to develop freely. The Jews in Ukraine have the most extended national rights." (21, 22)

The "clear and natural way" in which the "Jewish question" was solved in the Ukraine was by the murder and maiming of almost a million Jews.

The attitude of the Jewish bourgeoisie toward Kornilov, Denikin and other Russian pogromist generals, competitors of the Ukrainian Petlura, was the acme of loyalty. A bourgeois source testifies: "Many Jews took part in the celebrated 'campaign into the ice regions' of General Kornilov. A large number of them perished; some were decorated. It was the Jews who procured the greatest sums of money for the Volunteer Army. Thus, whereas the Russian society of Ekaterinodar supplied General Denikin with only 400,000 rubles, a single Jew of this city offered 800,000. And at present the Anti-Semites dare to write that the Jews took no part in the creation of the Volunteer Army . . .

"However, from the first victories of the Volunteers (in the course of the past year), the same thing happened to the Jews that happened to them at the outbreak of the World War (1914). At that period a vast patriotic wave stirred the Jewish masses. Thousands upon thousands of Jewish volunteers hastened to the support of their country. In all the cities the Jews organized patriotic parades. This movement had been spontaneous, not at all artificial. But the reaction was not long in coming; it proceeded from the Government and from the Right wing of Russian society. It was the dark period of the brutal eviction of the Jewish population of Poland, Kurland, and of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

districts of Kovno and Grodno. This drama was reproduced in 1919. The Jews of Kharkov, Ekaterinoslav and other large cities conquered by the Volunteers received the victors joyously. Thousands of Jews were enrolled as Volunteers. They began to gather big sums of money for the Army. But at this very moment commenced the persecution and the difficulties of the Jews and their representatives . . . Jewish blood flowed in streams. Wherever the Volunteers went, they organized massacres and robberies." *(The Massacres and Other Atrocities Against the Jews in Southern Russia,* 31, 32)

The Bolshevik source records the same story: "The Jewish inhabitant imagined that the whole matter resided in 'loyalty,' in dissociation from the Bolsheviks. In this respect he was ready, of course, to go the limit, since the economic policy of the Soviet power during war Communism very painfully affected the Jewish petty bourgeoisie. And so, the Jewish inhabitant resorted once again to the old, tried methods: deputations, welcoming the Volunteer Army, bribery, gifts, dispatching of delegations, intensified emphasis of political loyalty, etc. All in vain. Denikin's power brought the Jews the bitterest disappointments. The pogrom policy became more and more open; drunken Cossacks, savage Chechen hordes acted frightfully and the Jewish population fell from the 'Petlurovist' frying pan into the Denikinist fire." *(Jewish Pogroms,* 1918-1921, Moscow, 1926, 16)

The most popular song in Denikin's Army was:

"We will go into battle
For Holy Russia,
We will defeat the Jews,
This vile vermin."

While Petlura was shielded from exposure by his Dr. Margolins and Vishnitzers, Denikin was given a clean bill of health by distinguished Jewish bourgeois leaders such as Dr. Pasmanik a Zionist writer: "To beat up the Jews meant to save Russia. Such is the authentic truth about the Anti-Semitism of the Volunteer Army. Upon whom does the blame rest? Everybody understands that General Denikin did not want pogroms." (Dr. D. Pasmanik, *The Russian Revolution and the Jews,* R. 186). But Pasmanik entangled himself in a contradiction, for elsewhere in the same work he shows that Denikin made an "error" of being a pogromist: "The crude error of Denikin was that he shared the opinion of General Shkuro who, in reply to a rebuke addressed to him regarding robberies and pogroms which he permitted, replied: 'If I had not allowed this, my "wolves" would never have reached Orel.' " (182)

To summarize, both the representatives of the Jewish bourgeoisie and the Marxist leaders of the Jewish workers, the Right and the Left, in a political sense aided the pogromists. The Jewish bourgeoisie openly sided with the Denikins and Petluras and consciously covered up their pogromist activities. The Jewish workers were split into several camps; some followed the bourgeoisie directly; others followed

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Right Marxists who supported the pogromist regimes, and others went over to Lenin and Trotsky who through their Brest "peace" policy ushered in a bloodier era of mass extermination of the Jewish Scapegoat than any in the previous twenty centuries.

CHAPTER X.

STALIN HOUNDING THE JEWS IN THE U.S.S.R.

1. *Bolshevik anti-Jewish Pogroms in Daghestan*

THE TERMINATION of the Civil War in Russia brought the military pogroms to the end. Of the Jewish population approximately a million remained in the Ukraine and somewhat over a million in the rest of Russia. Useful to every privileged ruling minority, the Scapegoat was to fulfill its role also for the Bolshevik burocracy. In the Bolshevik Party and the State Russian nationalist pressure against the Jewish masses and the Jewish sector of the burocracy began to grow with the increase of the centralization of Stalin's power. In April 1923 at the Twelfth Congress of the Bolshevik Party, Stalin pretended to oppose this trend: "In connection with the NEP there is growing, not by the day but by the hour, the great-power chauvinism, the crassest nationalism which is striving to wipe out everything not Russian, to gather all threads of administration around the Russian principle and to crush the non-Russian." (Cited by L. Radischev, in *Poison, Anti-Semitism in Our Day,* R. Leningrad, 1930, 48). Stalin's "self-criticism" was but a cover for his own policy of Great-Russian nationalism and subtle anti-Semitism.

Another, far more effective cloak, was a series of trials of White Guard pogromists and various bandits. To the duped workers it seemed that Stalin led an attack on anti-Semitism; the very opposite was taking place. Trotsky, of course, was not blind to the fact that the Stalin faction employed anti-Semitism not only in general but specifically in its attacks on the Opposition. But while in the Party, Trotsky criminally maintained silence about the anti-Semitic aspect of Stalin's policy, and therefore, consciously, gave an indirect protection to anti-Semitism. Only many years later, as in the case of the Testament, did Trotsky make public something regarding the use of anti-Semitic poison by Stalin: "Since 1925 and above all since 1926, anti-Semitic demagogy, well camouflaged, unattackable, goes hand in hand with symbolic trials against avowed pogromists . . . An important part of the Jewish petty bourgeoisie has been absorbed by the formidable apparatuses of the state, industry, commerce, the cooperatives, etc., above all in their lower and middle layers. This fact engenders an anti-Semitic state of feeling and the leaders manipulate it with a cunning skill in order to canalize and to direct especially against the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Jews the existing discontent against the burocracy." (*Fourth Int.* Dec. 1945, 378)

It was no accident that the overwhelming majority of the Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev Opposition was Jewish. Under the goad of ever-growing Russian chauvinism which, as Stalin admitted, strove "to wipe out everything not Russian," the most advanced Jewish workers and the Jewish Bolshevik burocrats irresistibly moved toward Trotsky-Zinoviev-Kamenev. The Russian Bolshevik burocrats, the specialists, and the backward Russian workers to whom "Trotskyism" represented an impenetrable tangle but who were casually reminded by Stalin's agents that the Oppositionists were Jews, leaned toward the non-Jewish leadership of Stalin—Voroshilov—Molotov—Kalinin. It reached such a pass that Stalin, to save face, "clarified" the situation. Trotsky testifies: "Nor were these the only methods of Stalinist rebuttal. He and his henchmen even stooped to fish in the muddied water of anti-Semitism. I recall particularly a cartoon in the *Rabochaya Gazeta* [Worker's Gazette] entitled 'Comrade Trotsky and Zinoviev.' There were any number of such caricatures and doggerels of anti-Semitic character in the Party press. They were received with sly snickers. Stalin's attitude toward this growing anti-Semitism was one of friendly neutrality. But matters went so far that he was forced to come out with a published statement which declared, 'We are fighting Trotsky, Zinoviev and Kamenev not because they are Jews, but because they are Oppositionists,' and the like. It was absolutely clear to everyone who thought politically that his deliberately equivocal declaration was aimed merely at the 'excesses' of anti-Semitism, while at the same time broadcasting throughout the entire Soviet press the very pregnant reminder, 'Don't forget that the leaders of the Opposition are Jews.' Such a statement gave carte blanche to the anti-Semites." (*Stalin*, 399-400)

In those years when foreign correspondents and visitors of all sorts were virtually free to enter and leave the Soviet Union it would have been suicidal for Stalin to risk a pogrom tactic in large cities like Kiev or Odessa. However, there were Jews in a number of mountain towns in Daghestan, a section of Trans-caucasia. Bolshevik burocrat Yu. Larin records that in 1926 a Jewish pogrom took place in the capital of Daghestan and spread to a few near-by towns. To incite the benighted natives against the Jews, the Blood Accusation, so successfully employed by the Tsar's agents to engineer the massacre of Kishinev, was skillfully introduced. Although Larin does his utmost to omit anything that would point an accusing finger at the ruling group in Moscow, he tells enough for the perspicacious reader to more than suspect who the true culprits were. It will be of moment to recall that Larin was a big Jewish figure in the history of the Bolshevik State. He was one of the signers of decrees of the Sovnarkom in the early Lenin period. Apart from that—"Larin . . . took part in the nationalization of industry, organization of monopoly of foreign

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

trade, organization of the State Planning Commission, in the All-Union Society for Settling Toiling Jews on the Land, in the elaboration of labor legislation. A writer on economic questions." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXXV, 762-3)

Here is something of what Larin revealed regarding the Bolshevik anti-Jewish pogroms in Daghestan:

" 'The political scandal' writes Comrade Nikolsky, 'consists in that in our U.S.S.R. there can be no underprivileged nationalities; sufficiently impressive facts show that the mountain-inhabiting Jews are in reality deprived of equal rights, and these are deadly facts.' Comrade Nikolsky further notes that in this business not a small role has been played by anti-Semitism, and adds 'It is impossible to wriggle out of this conclusion no matter how unpleasant it might be.' . . . (in 1926) in the capital of Daghestan, Makhach-Kale, a Jewish pogrom broke out and was immediately repeated in several other cities of Daghestan. The pogrom movement arose on the ground of an accusation against the Jews of using Mussulman blood, and was evidently prepared in advance, which explains its simultaneous action. But even this unparalleled fact in the U.S.S.R., which disgraced Daghestan, did not evoke from the Daghestan Government any sort of change in practice with respect to the impoverished mountain-Jewry, ruined and deprived of rights 'because of Bolshevism.' " *(Jews and Anti-Semitism in U.S.S.R.,* R. 129-30)

2. *Stalin Uses the Jewish Scapegoat During the Unemployment and Housing Shortage Crises*

In the housing shortage which resulted in unprecedented congestion and widespread discontent, Stalin cynically promoted an ideology of Jewish segregation. The Jews, it was implied, were out of place in the industrial centers. They were to be gathered up and settled on the land in the Crimea. The anti-Semitic idea of excluding the Jewish masses from the Russian cities was never intended to be carried out in practice. It was designed only to divert the mass discontent into anti-Jewish channels.

Under the guise of seeking to solve the "Jewish Question" the Stalin burocracy unleashed an official campaign against the Jewish Scapegoat. Even the highest functionaries participated in the anti-Semitic drive. The "President" of the U.S.S.R. and member of the Politburo, Kalinin, made a subtle attack on the Jewish sector of the Bolshevik burocracy: "When in one of the plants I was asked: 'Why are there so many Jews in Moscow?' I replied 'If I were an old rabbi whose heart pains for the Jewish nation I would have put a curse on all the Jews who go to Moscow to look for Soviet jobs because they are lost to its nation.' (Laughter, applause)." *(Jews Agriculturists in the Union of Peoples in the USSR,* R. 8-9)

With the "Crimea" maneuvers (1925-28) Stalin induced two diametrically opposite anti-Semitic reactions among the Russian

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

masses. One: get the Jews out of Moscow and other congested centers! The other: why should Crimea be given to the Jews! The first was assiduously suggested by the Stalin burocrats virtually in the open, as witnessed by Kalinin's speech. The other was unofficially spread among the Russian workers who then turned upon the Jews. Thus, a young Communist worker shouted to a Jewish worker: "Hey, you, Jewish mug! What is it you are after? You want to establish a separate republic? You want us to give you the Crimea? Never." (Zhigalin, *A Cursed Legacy,* R. Moscow-Leningrad, 1927, 98). Meanwhile in the Crimea itself Stalin's high satraps who headed this Tartar "Autonomous Socialist Soviet Republic" opened a fearful anti-Semitic agitation against the prospective Jewish settlers. "An example of such Kulak agitation is the conduct of Veli Ibraimov who in 1926 and 1927 was the Chairman of the Central Executive Committee of the Crimean Republic . . . 'Ibraimov, *who had just returned from Moscow* (Our emphasis—G. S.), gave an interview to the Simferopol paper *Krasni Krim* of November 26, 1926, in which he endeavored to arouse the benighted portion of the Tartar masses against the Jewish settlers.'" (Yu. Larin, 150)

In recording the Stalin anti-Semitic agitation, Larin, to shield the real instigator, invented an active underground Tsarist organization upon which he put the blame for the attacks on the Jews: "It has been established, for example, in Moscow, that simultaneously in various factories in different boroughs identical slogans are put forth in the anti-Jewish agitation. For instance, at one time everywhere talk, no one knows whence, begins: 'Russians are being sent to Narym but Jews to Krim [Crimea].' This talk continues for a while and then again suddenly in different factories talk on a different 'Jewish' theme is simultaneously substituted, again uniform everywhere: 'in order to ease the housing congestion it is necessary to expel all Jews from Moscow.' And so forth. It turned out that this synchronized initiation of anti-Jewish talks in different factories was always preceded by and accompanied with the distribution of secret proclamations on this same subject by a conspiratorial organization of monarchists." (254)

Anti-Jewish hounding and terror ran rampant in Stalin's Young Communist League. "Anti-Semitism is taking on the sharpest and ugliest forms—ranging from persistent intriguing against non-Party Jewish comrades to open incitement of the Russian non-Party masses against them. Especially in the midst of the Young Communist League does anti-Semitism acquire ugly forms and leads to a systematically organized anti-Semitic agitation inflamed with national antagonism. In these instances the methods employed are borrowed from the arsenal of the Tsarist secret police and gendarmerie, including even (true, individual) cases of hooligan slugging of Jews to an unconscious condition." (Zhigalin, 185). "The editorial room of *Komsomolskaya Pravda* received letters from localities indicating a dark picture of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

growth of anti-Semitism not only among the non-Partyites and Young Communist League members but, unfortunately, also among the Communists." (98). "On the day when these lines are written, *Komsomolskaya Pravda* makes public nightmarish occurrences which emit a mouldy smell of the horror of the Middle Ages. It is the report of the manifestation of anti-Semitism in the Kharkov university." (E. Dobin, *The Truth About the Jews,* Leningrad, 1928, R.3)

In the Spring of 1928 the supposed plan to settle the Jews in the Crimea was abandoned by the Stalin burocracy and a new Jewish segregation ideological means was introduced to divert mass discontent into anti-Jewish channels—a Jewish "republic" in Biro-Bidjan. The territory of Biro-Bidjan was described by one of Stalin's burocrats: "The Soviet Government in the Spring of this year adopted therefore a decision on the planned settling of Jewish agricultural workers in the Biro-Bidjan district in the Far East on the border of Manchuria. The region is virtually deserted, its population is one (1) person per square kilometer. The soil was never cultivated and because of that it is unbelievably difficult to till. There are no roads. The climate is severe (the mean temperature for January 20 degrees below), to which the inhabitants of the average territory of the U.S.S.R. are unaccustomed. In the summer people suffer terribly from 'gnos' that is bugs and mosquitoes existing in countless numbers. This region is ten thousand miles from the localities usually inhabited by the Jewish population." (Dobin, 11)

No wonder the Jewish masses did not flock to this "paradise" picked for them by Stalin. Three years later a report on Biro-Bidjan was referred to by *The American Jewish Year Book for* 1931-1932: "Settlement in Biro Bidjan, in the Far Eastern Republic, was not popular among the Jews in Russia and the official in charge of the project was compelled to seek recruits for it in Latvia, Lithuania, and even Argentine. In February, it was reported that only 2,700 Jews are settled in Biro Bidjan." (96). In reality Stalin was not at all interested in settling the Jews of the U.S.S.R. in Biro-Bidjan. His State apparatus at this point was sufficiently powerful to exile or destroy tens of thousands of Opposition workers, to banish even Trotsky; and if Stalin so desired a million Jews could easily have been uprooted and transported to the wilds of Biro-Bidjan. His aim was *political.* He needed the Jews in European Russia and the Ukraine for their conventional role. Before, the cry had been: Jews, get out of Moscow, Kiev and other Russian centers. Go to the Crimea! Now it was: Jews, go to Biro-Bidjan! Jews get out of the factories, settle on the land! The highest Stalinist officials were instigating this hounding. The People's Commissar of Health, Semashko, declared: "Every class-conscious worker and peasant must help Ozet to settle the Jews on the land. Jews—on the land! Such must be the slogan not only of the toiling Jew but also of the toilers of every other nationality." *(Tribuna,* Moscow, June 15, 1929, 3). The mockery of it all was that, as in the case

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Crimean swindle, an accusation was set afoot that the Jewish settlers were seizing the richest lands in the USSR.

The sector of the Jewish Scapegoat in the clutches of Stalin was driven from pillar to post. " 'If a Jew finds an office job,' writes Comrade Meshcheriakov, 'he is told: "You are taking away work from Russians." He goes to the factory—there he is told the same thing by the workers. The Jews make an attempt to become agriculturists, but they are told, "You are grabbing the best lands." What then should the Jews do? What work can they find when they are driven out everywhere?' " (Radishchev, *Poison, On Anti-Semitism of Our Day,* R. 94). Another of Stalin's burocrats, pretending not to know the true source of growing anti-Semitism and Jew-hounding, put the blame on priests and others: "To conduct open anti-Soviet work is dangerous, and among the workers hardly possible. In this situation recourse is made to the old tried method of struggle against revolution—anti-Semitic propaganda. And so the market women, priests of the old regime and all kinds of city trash whisper persistently: Why is there unemployment? Because the Jews took all the jobs and don't give us a chance. Why is there a housing shortage? Because the Jews penetrated into the cities and grabbed all the vacant apartments. Why is there burocratism in the industrial enterprises? Because the functionaries are Jews. Why don't wages increase as fast as we should like? Because the Jewish power favors the specialists who are Jews too. Who exploits the toiling masses? The Nepmen. But who are the Nepmen? Jews." (Dobin, 42-43)

Stalin's Politburo maintained an official silence on the issue. This "mysterious" tactic evoked a pointed question at a meeting held in Moscow in August 1928: "Why don't Bukharin, Stalin and other members of the Politburo ever write in *Pravda* about anti-Semitism?" (Cited by Larin, 240)

In the markets and factories the masses were taught that Jews and Nepmen were synonyms. But who gave them this idea? A Stalinist booklet, written ostensibly to enlighten the workers on the Jewish religion, said the following: "The Synagogue is the trade union of Nepmen." (Shakhnovitch, *Whom the 'Israel Religion' Serves,* R. 24). Another "educational" feature in the Stalinist booklet is: "Through the entire 'Religion of Israel' like a red thread runs the omnipotence of hard cash." (33). This definition, substantially, is identical with Marx's in his essay the *Jewish Question.* The Stalin writer added a modern touch to this Marxist definition: "The 'God of Israel' is Fascist." (13)

3. *Stalin Eliminating Jews from the Burocracy; Miscellaneous Attacks on the Jews*

There was a steady decline in the number of Jews in the Bolshevik Party and they totally disappeared from many centers of administrative activity. Most significant, the fewer Jews remaining in Stalin's apparatus the more fiercely raged the anti-Semitic storm. These telltale facts had to be covered-up with appropriate "self-criticism," and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

who could perform this better and gain confidence among the persecuted Jewish masses more effectively than Jewish Bolshevik burocrats! So Larin made a montage of facts, distortions and "self-criticism," and gave an assurance that something would be done to remedy the situation. First, he admitted that the Russian proletariat under Stalin was more imbued with anti-Semitism than under the Tsar: "Anti-Semitism among the workers began to develop notably precisely in recent years. The difference between the Soviet anti-Semitism and the pre-Revolutionary anti-Semitism is that before the Revolution there was hardly any anti-Semitism among the workers." (247). Larin pointed out that because there were now fewer Jews in high posts, conditions for White Guard anti-Semitic agitation were less propitious than before: "Why is it that White Guardist agitation was not so widespread eight or nine years ago? Then, be it recalled, it would seem that in our situation there were more objective favorable moments for it: at that time there were a number of Jews in the Politburo, a number of People's Commissars were Jews, etc. Now by accidental circumstances we have no Jews in the Politburo. Accidentally too there are no Jews among the People's Commissars. But despite all that the anti-Jewish agitation then was less than today." (256). Larin further recorded that "*the deeper one goes back into Soviet history the higher the percentage of Jews in the Party in general and in the Party aktiv in particular.*... Such is the second fact: the percentage of participation of the Jews in the Party and the Party aktiv has steadily decreased." (257). In this instance Larin could hardly ascribe the systematic elimination of Jewish burocrats and workers from the Party institutions to phantom "monarchists." Nor could he tell the truth that it was Stalin who was secretly directing the drive against the Jews in the Party and in the State. All he could do was to plead negligence, to report the "virtually complete absence in the last years of systematic educational work against anti-Semitism both within the Party and outside of it. This last circumstance played a particularly big part." (258)

Larin felt free to tell fables about the elimination of Jews from the Politburo and other high institutions being "accidental" and could blame the sweep of anti-Semitism in all social layers of the Bolshevik State on the lack of education. But he could not offer these sham explanations in discussing Stalin's anti-Jewish policy of withholding even the formal constitutional rights of the Jews: "According to the Constitution every nationality which forms the majority of the population in a given locality has the right to establish there a national Soviet (with the guarantee of freedom of the native national tongue to the minority of the given locality). On a number of occasions the unfulfillment of this feature for the Jews creates in the local population the view that the Jewish toilers are not citizens with full equality of rights, that they are second class citizens (since the general provisions of the Constitution are not applied to them) . . . at Berdichev (and a number of similar cities with an overwhelming majority of the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Jewish population) *the Constitution for some reason stops short.* With respect to carrying out the right of the majority of the local population in the local Soviet in its own language—Berdichev and similar cities up till now, it seems, have not entered into the composition of the USSR. For them the 'law has not yet been written.' " (286)

Larin and other Stalinist sham fighters against anti-Semitism recorded that the atmosphere was polluted with anti-Semitic humor. "Abusive remarks, mockery, jeers, addressed to the Jewish toilers are widely practiced. Various jokes about Jews are being spread." (240)

Similar testimony is presented by another Stalinist writer, Radishchev, who cites *Pravda:* " 'From anti-Semitic hooting, spitting in the face, threats to cut the throat—from all this it is not far to a Jewish pogrom, as is visualized by some "good-natured" ones.' Here every step helps to pull a man to the next one without him being aware of it. Precisely in this resides the power of anti-Semitism as a means of propaganda. By the use of anecdotes, specific jokes there is being created a poisoned atmosphere of national hatred and contempt . . ." (62)

Anti-Semitic humor was employed not only to cultivate contempt and derision towards the Jews but also to negate "investigations" of brutal outrages carried out by Bolshevik anti-Semitic hoodlums. Thus, in the Kharkov university a Jewish student was bombarded with old shoes and a pregnant Jewish woman was trampled upon by these hooligans. An "investigation," naturally, was ordered.

"The Chairman of the Special Commission on investigating facts of anti-Semitism in the communal quarters of the Kharkov Geodez Institute, who was at the same time secretary of the Party nucleus, made a report at a Party meeting. The Secretary's report bore a pronounced humorous character. The Secretary turned out to be a true wit . . . 'To speak plainly nothing happened. Can one say that Lishenko and Mikula are hooligans? These boys were just playing. Nobody is responsible for the fact that a shoe hit a student in the head. We ourselves, after all, are teaching the students good marksmanship. People are talking about a pregnant Jewess. Indeed, we do not deny that this event occurred, but we are submitting a fundamental correction. She was given a blow in the belly not because she was a Jewess but because we were getting ready for a football match, so he gave her a swift one.' " (Radishchev, 33)

A measure of the depth to which the poison of Stalin's anti-Semitism penetrated can be found in the attitude of the non-Jewish workers towards the Jews in State institutions and in the Bolshevik Party. Radishchev cites a worker's opinion: " 'It will be proper not to permit Jews in our apparatus, in the center, in the capitals and in our institutions of learning, or at least to put up a strong barrier against the possibility of their entry.' " (60). " 'I am surprised,' says another Soviet fellow, 'that they, the Jews, are accepted into the All-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Union Communist Party, a holy, just Party. I will never trust a Jew Party member.' " (61)

The Stalin burocrats succeeded in manufacturing the delusion, mainly for foreign Jewish consumption, that anti-Semitism was being fought and would be eradicated. However, Stalin's courts were extremely lax toward anti-Semitic offenders and this attitude was noted and "criticised" by the Larins: "Meanwhile in practice, as we have shown above, here and there and everywhere, even the judiciary organs evince a considerably tolerant attitude toward anti-Semitic manifestations. Here *Komsomolskaya Pravda* gives a fresh example of the court practice in the city of Moscow for 1929." And Larin cited a light sentence passed upon two hooligans who had carried out a pogrom in a Jewish house. (277-8). He further showed that the Party was extremely indulgent towards the worst type of anti-Semitic incitement: "At a meeting on the issue of anti-Semitism called in the Spring of 1929 *Nasha Gazeta* brought out the facts showing how a nucleus of the Neftsyndicate 'bawled out' (and that's all) a woman, a Party member since 1919, for telling non-Party people that instances occur of Christian children being kidnapped by Jews for making matzos out of their blood, etc." (281). Stalin's policy in the Party and in the courts assisted in spreading Blood Accusations: "On M-Basmannoi Street in Moscow a four-year old Russian girl, daughter of a worker, left the house. A quarter of an hour later the child was found near the house peacefully eating a stick of candy. But there were 'clever' people who even in ten minutes succeeded in spreading the poisonous rumor that the child had been kidnapped by the Jews in order to kill it and use the blood for matzos. The blood gossip was spread in the building and soon—it was after the child had already been found—in the factory too there was talk that the Jews had made an attempt to kill the girl." (*Tribuna,* May 15, 1929, 25)

To promote the growth of anti-Semitic ideology Stalin enlisted his "Soviet" artists, poets and novelists. Some of these writers evidently received instructions on producing literature which was ostensibly against anti-Semitism but in reality was anti-Semitic itself: "Here is a standard recipe for preparing plays of the above-cited category. In accord with this recipe, for instance, was prepared the well-known *Bribe* which has already received a reply in the press. The central characters are two swindlers-Jews with an emphasized accent. To them is added an appropriate Jewess. They defraud an excellent but weak-willed Bolshevik. The Bolshevik is a Russian, a wonderful-soul, a sailor. The Jews practice cheating, hand out bribes, fawn. At the same time they 'dig a grave' for each other. And to boot, the Jewess mercilessly exploits her domestic servant, a wonderful 'charming' Russian girl. For greater effect, the accent is overdone to the point of absurdity and derision." (Radishchev, 101). "The novel *Ford* by Julius Berzin has been widely noted and has met, as the saying goes in such instances, sympathetic response among critics . . . In *Ford* there is no Jewish Bol-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

shevik. There are Jewish Nepmen, speculators, swindlers, grafters and everything else attributed to Jews.

"And so, all Jews are Nepmen and all Nepmen are Jews. What is this? It is a bribe which in this case should be written without quotation marks. The bribe is given to the anti-Semitic mood of the spectator." (102-3)

The Bolshevik-Jewish *Tribuna* found itself compelled to recognize some "strange" features in plays which, purportedly, had been produced to combat anti-Semitism. One of the plays, *The Crime of Citizen Surkov,* by Kepusko, contained a peculiar portrayal of Evripadov, the leading anti-Semite: "Strange, too, that Evripadov, the chief inspirer of the hounding of Beichik, is presented in the style of Dostoyevsky, with a halo of the sufferer and martyr. This does direct harm to the aim which the play pursues." Another play, *Call the Factory Committee,* gave a tender-hearted representation of anti-Semitism: "Further, anti-Semitism in this play is portrayed as some sort of a minor misunderstanding." *(Tribuna,* Oct. 25, 1929, 25)

Gorki's indirect contribution to Stalin's policy was bewilderment and intellectual helplessness before anti-Semitism. His supposed attack on anti-Semitism was disseminated through Stalin's press: "A few days ago scoundrels from the family of villains sent me a leaflet entitled 'Order to all Communists' the authors of which preferred, for obvious reasons, to hide behind the pseudonym 'Communist Committee'. The 'order' is well written and is abominable, calling on the Communists to institute a Jewish pogrom. 'Arise, Russian people and all peoples, Tartars, Chuvaches, etc., and kill the Jews.' . . . I ask myself a question: How is it possible that on the eve of the thirteenth anniversary of October there appear among us such papers? What sort of a cultural environment is it which allows in its midst such an abomination as anti-Semitism? Are we to believe the vicious assertions of the White Guard emigree press that the Communists too are infected with anti-Semitism? . . . I still can't understand this strange fact: how is it that in a country in which, not in words but in reality, in deed, the entire State and cultural work of its dictator, the working class, the entire labor of its brain, the Party, rejects national antagonism—in this country so shamefully and cynically flares up anti-Semitism—the most perilous expression of man-hating? There can be no question that it is necessary to fight anti-Semitism. But there are two questions: Is there an adequate struggle? And—how to struggle? M. Gorki." *(Pravda,* Sept. 26, 1929)

Unquestionably Gorki either read or heard something about the pogroms in Daghestan. Even abroad some information about Larin's report was published: "Moscow, June 27. Former leaders of Denikin's pogrom bands, now holding posts in local Soviets in Daghestan, are terrorizing the mountain Jews, writes J. Larin, Jewish leader, in an article in the *Pravda,* the government organ. The mountain Jews are in a terrible economic and political position, Larin writes. The

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

authorities practice violence against them, assuming the character of massacres." *(Jewish Daily Bull.* June 28, 1929). Gorki was, of course sufficiently informed to know that the White Guard emigree press, deceitful and venomous towards the Jews, was telling the truth about the anti-Semitic infection in Stalin's Bolshevik Party. What Drumont's *Libre Parole* quickly discerned in the Socialist Jaures, the Black Hundred press slowly distinguished in the Bolshevik Party and State—the unmistakable, dear to its heart, note of anti-Semitism. Apparently the pressure of anti-Semitism caused the Jewish Communist Party members think of the Trotskyites. This was indicated in a Stalin Jewish paper, as noted by the *Jewish Daily Bulletin:* "Trotsky has a greater following among Jewish workers in Russia than among other elements of the population, complains the Moscow Communist Yiddish daily *Emes.* 'It is no secret that Trotskyism has special success among the Jewish workers, clerks and the intelligentzia.' " (Feb. 5, 1929). On the other hand, accusation of Trotskyism was now charged specially against the Jewish workers.

Many honest advanced Gentile workers, appalled by the sweep of the anti-Semitic plague, wrote letters calling the attention of the "Soviet" notables to manifestation of anti-Semitism among the high Bolshevik functionaries. One letter received by Gorki cited Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich. A researcher digging in the archives of the Lenin-Trotsky period of the Sovnarkom regime will find Bonch-Bruevich's signature on many official documents including decrees issued by Lenin. The letter said: "Vladimir Bonch-Bruevich has a book *At the Military Posts of the February and October Revolutions* (Published by *Federation,* Moscow 1930). Describing the search of his estate in Finland in the Summer of 1917, Bonch-Bruevich writes: '. . . from boarding-houses and estates poured out well-dressed vacationists, chiefly representatives of the most revolting bourgeoisie! Two sort of stout, good-looking Jewesses . . . Nearby, paying court to them, were, just like them, well-fed young Jews of a very suspicious speculator type . . .' It is altogether unclear what Bonch-Bruevich means by the words 'representatives of the most revolting bourgeoisie.' What bourgeoisie? Should one think that the Jewish is the most revolting bourgeoisie, because he goes on to tell about the two Jewesses and the 'well-fed Jews.' And since when did Bonch-Bruevich begin to think along such lines and why did he begin to think in that manner?" *(Izvestia,* June 24, 1931)

The specific brand of anti-Semitic poison popularized by Bonch-Bruevich was not new; it had been cultivated among the workers by the Left and Right anti-Semites for many decades. Bolshevik Jewish workers were infected with it: " 'I am an apprentice tractor mechanic,' writes Comrade Rubiner. 'I hate any bourgeoisie of any brand but I must say that our Jewish bourgeoisie is worse than all the others.' " (Gorev, *Against Anti-Semites,* R. 120-1)

Another letter to Gorki recalled Pilniak's anti-Semitic work writ-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ten when the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev Trio, with the backing of Trotsky, ruled the Marxist State. What struck the writer was Pilniak's contemptuous bracketing of Jews with dogs, practiced, as we know, in the Jewish Execution in Germany, by Khmelnitsky, and in general by the tyrants of the Middle Ages. "Boris Pilniak in his story *Ledokhod,* in which he describes Makhnovchina and which was written in 1924, i. e., when the question 'who-whom' was by far not yet solved and when our enemies were still strong, I read on page 81: 'Towards the morning began a Jewish pogrom, always terrible because the Jews getting together by the hundreds were starting to howl more awful than hundreds of dogs when they howl at the moon and with the abominable tradition of the Jewish featherbeds covering the windy streets with the down.' The association of Jews and dogs, with Pilniak, is amazingly easy. In the same work on page 97 Pilniak writes: '. . . the Jew wore a coat, his back was emaciated, for some reason it looked like a dog's . . .' . . . In the Jewish pogrom the most terrible thing for him is not the pogrom itself but the fact that the Jews 'were starting to howl more awful than hundreds of dogs.' " (Cited by Gorki, *Izvestia,* June 24, 1931)

In the USSR every political work ostensibly written with the aim of combatting anti-Semitism contained anti-Semitic poison in one form or another. Here is the most deceiving title of all: *Against Anti-Semites,* by E. Gorev. Probably inadvertently, as is usual with unconscious anti-Semites, Gorev implied that all Jews were rotten and that the rottennest section of Jewry had emigrated to America. He conveyed the impression to the Russian readers that there were no workers among the Jews in New York, only money-hoarders: "Jewry was intensely emigrating to America. Those who emigrated were the most clever and rottennest part of it. Some with dollars, others without dollars but with shrewdness and ability to take the arch-bourgeois life by the horns and measure their strength with it. In America there are three million Jews, and of these, exactly a million and a half are sitting in New York. They rustle with dollars, multiplying their capital in the banks." (147)

While the poison of anti-Semitism was increasingly ravaging the mind of the population of the USSR, and the Jews were being subjected to burocratic discrimination and hounding, Stalin's agents abroad lied: "In the Soviet Union there is no longer a Jewish question. There it has been solved as part of the question of national minorities. Only there is it possible for the Jewish people, freed from all forms of exploitation and oppression, to develop its national culture." *(New Masses,* Dec. 4, 1934)

During the ensuing years the Stalin burocracy engaged in a vigorous campaign of glorifying everything and everyone Russian. Peter the Great, Alexander Nevsky, Ivan the Terrible, Pushkin and other eminent figures in Russia's history were idolized as part of Russia's "glorious" past. In spreading this Russian-nationalism Stalin's most

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

effective agents among the Jewish workers were the Jewish burocrats in the USSR who even debased themselves to a point of lauding known anti-Semites if such was the line of the Kremlin. For example in 1937 the paper of the Jewish burocrats *Emes* in an editorial "The Jewish People and the Soviet Family of Nations" were developing the "Jewish" national culture along these lines: "It is, for example, difficult to determine whether we feel a love toward Alexander Pushkin as we do toward a Yiddish poet, but we are bound to, as a person of Russian nationality."

By 1937 the Defamation poison had become widespread even among Russian children. A Liberal bourgeois journal, probably out of ignorance, asserted: "It cannot be denied that the Soviet Government has done and continues to do, all in its power to stem the tidal-wave of anti-Semitism." Simultaneously this journal recorded: "How Russian children regarded the Jews may be judged from the following incident: During a lesson a teacher, explaining a passage from Gogol about witches drinking blood, remarked that such things only happened in fairy tales, and that no human beings drank blood. At once a little girl sprang to her feet and said: 'Don't you know that Jews drink blood?' The teacher looked at her astounded. 'Yes, Jews drink human blood' the little girl repeated. A chorus of young voices went up in corroboration, all insisting that it was a traditional custom of Jews to drink Christian blood. Some children even said that they had seen Jews drinking blood; and the Jewish pupil, Krivosheiev, was plied with the question: 'Is Christian blood very tasty?'" *(Contemporary Russia,* Autumn 1937, II, #1, 30-31)

The Stalin-Hitler Pact accelerated Stalin's anti-Semitic policy in two ways. First, with Stalin's occupation of Eastern Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Esthonia and Bessarabia, additional Jews came under his rule, but were denied even the formal appearance of representation. Second, Stalin made further personnel changes in State institutions so that Hitler's emissaries would be spared the embarrassment of contact with Jews.

4. *Shakespeare's "Shylock"—an anti-Semitic Monstrosity*

One of the cornerstones of the artistic literary form of anti-Semitism is William Shakespeare's play *The Merchant of Venice* (1596). The central figure in the play is a "Jew" usurer, Shylock, who lends money to a Christian merchant, Antonio, with the written agreement that the latter give up a pound of his own flesh in the event he is unable to repay the debt. Upon Antonio's failure, Shylock in court demands the pound of flesh.

Shakespeare took an old play which contained no Jewish character and remodeled it along the lines of the Defamation. "The famous dramatist who to suit the London temper of his day consciously transposed the characters in the original story at the basis of 'The Merchant

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of Venice' and branded the Jew as a Shylock for all time, illustrates the attitude of those centuries. Springing from these conditions came the conception of a Jew as a kind of Barabbas, in Marlowe's play, who poisons wells, murders chilrden, commits all kinds of wickedness in his hatred of the Christians." *(Enc. Americana,* XVI, 99)

Shakespeare constructed a monster in human form, dressed him in the clothing the Church prescribed for the Jews, and had him spew hatred against Antonio because Antonio was a Christian, but more so because Antonio did not take interest on loans and was therefore undermining usury—Shylock's trade: "I hate him for he is a Christian, but more for that in low simplicity he lends out money gratis and brings down the rate of usance here with us in Venice." (Shylock in Act I, Scene 3)

The part of the Defamation that the Jews hated the Christians, openly expressed through Shylock, naturally was calculated by Shakespeare to intensify hatred for the Jews in the mind of the Christian spectators. When Antonio imagines that Shylock's heart is melted to kindness, he says: "This Hebrew will turn Christian; he grows kind." The implication of this remark is that Christians are kindly, Jews are black-hearted. Shakespeare, however, placed no kindness in the heart of the "Jew" of his imagination. Shylock says: "But yet I'll go in hate, to feed upon the prodigal Christian." (Act II, Scene 5). When Antonio pleads with Shylock for mercy he receives the cold, brutal reply: "I'll have my bond; I will not hear thee speak."

Shakespeare portrays the nobles of Venice as helpless before Shylock's "legal" claim. The Duke sympathises with Antonio: "I am sorry for thee: thou art come to answer a stony adversary, an inhuman wretch uncapable of pity, void and empty from any dream of mercy."

Antonio in court reflects upon the cruelty of the *Jewish* heart: "You may as well use question with the wolf . . . you may as well do anything most hard, as seek to soften that—that which what's harder?—his Jewish heart."

Portia, the judge, a beautiful, sweet, young Christian woman, pleads with the appalling "Jew" monster: "Why, this bond is forfeit; and lawfully by this the Jew may claim a pound of flesh, to be by him cut of nearest the merchant's heart. Be merciful: Take thrice thy money; bid me tear the bond." Shylock coldly retorts: "When it is paid according to tenour." When Portia pleads with Shylock that he at least provide a surgeon for Antonio "to stop his wounds, lest he do bleed to death," Shylock's brutal reply is: " 'tis not in the bond."

Antonio is finally saved when Portia points out that while the "Jew" is entitled to his pound of flesh, he is forbidden to spill a single drop of *Christian* blood—"take thou thy pound of flesh; but, in cutting it, if thou dost shed one drop of Christian blood, thy lands and goods are, by the laws of Venice confiscate." (Act IV, Scene 1). The "Jew" is frustrated. Under the threat of punishment for scheming to murder Antonio he agrees to become a Christian. Jessica, Shylock's daughter,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

portrayed by Shakespeare as a lovely girl, the direct opposite of her father, had earlier broken with the Jews and married a Gentile: "I shall be saved by my husband, he hath made me a Christian." (Act III, Scene 5)

Shakespeare performed an extremely valuable service for the Defamation. Neither before nor after Shakespeare has anyone produced such a powerful literary anti-Jewish incitement as *The Merchant of Venice*. However, "Shylock" is not the only anti-Semitic feature in Shakespeare's works. Several of his major plays contain uncomplimentary references to Jews. In *Macbeth* (Act IV), among the contents of the witches' couldron are: "Fillet of a jenny snake . . . Eye of newt and toe of frog, Adder's fork and blind-worm's sting, Lizard's leg and owlet's wing . . . Scale of dragon, tooth of wolf, Witches' mummy, maw and gulf of the ravin'd salt sea-shark, Root of hemlock digg'd i' the dark, Liver of blaspheming Jew . . ." In *Richard II*, Shakespeare speaks of "The Sepulchre in stubborn Jewry." (Act II). In *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Shakespeare makes the Jews appear as the epitome of hard-heartedness by having Launce remark, "A Jew would have wept to have seen our parting." (Act II, 3). Launce is presented as holding the Jews in contempt: "If thou wilt, go with me to the alehouse; if not, thou art an Hebrew, a Jew, and not worth the name of a Christian." (II, 5). *In Much Ado About Nothing* Bene says: "If I do not take pity of her, I am a villain; if I do not love her, I am a Jew." (II, 3). Othello in Act V says: "I took by the throat the circumcised dog and smote him." Mrs. Page in *Merry Wives of Windsor* exclaims in revulsion: "What a Herod of Jewry is this!" (II, I)

A small section of the Jewish bourgeoisie in the capitalist world has been making efforts to block the performance of *The Merchant of Venice*, and the Gentile rulers have occasionally granted some limited temporary concessions on this point: "Owing to the efforts of the Anti-Defamation League, *The Merchant of Venice* is not given in the English courses in most public schools of the U. S." *(Enc. of Jewish Knowledge*, De Haas, 515)

The name "Shylock" has been opprobriously identified with Jews in many, if not all, countries. Thus: "The leader of the Czechs in Austria, Francis Palacky (1798-1876), a Protestant, said, in his farewell address to the Czech nation, that the Jews were Shylocks." *(Jewish Enc.* I, 643). "A Federalist journalist in 1795 denounced a prominent Jewish Jeffersonian as a 'Shylock.' " (M. Schappes, *Masses and Mainstream*, Oct. 1948). In 1795 a printer, Rivington, published Henry James Pye's novel *The Democrat* with a preface of his own in which he made an attack on the handful of Jews in America: "This itinerant gang will easily be known by their physiognomy; they all seem to be, like their Vice-President, of the tribe of Shylock." (Cited in *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, Dec. 1948, Part 2, 110). "B. F. Shively, the free silver candidate for governor of Indiana, in the course of a harangue at Peru said 'Every hook-nosed Shylock from Jerusalem

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to Omaha is hoarding up his gold.' " *(American Israelite,* Oct. 1, 1896). Populists cried: "Down with the hook-nosed Shylocks of Wall Street!" *(Ib.)* "*Shylock.* In Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice,* an avaricious and revengeful Jew, who endeavors to exact from Antonio's body the pound of flesh he was liable to forfeit." (Funk and Wagnall's *New St. Dict.* 2267). In the everyday language of the backward masses, a bloodsucker "Jew" and Shylock are synonymous: "*Dishonest or Unethical Business Establishment.* Clip or gyp joint, gyppery, shylock shop." *(American Thesaurus of Slang,* Berrey, Bark, 524). "*Transact business* . . . Jew, Shylock, yinceth, to deceive in a transaction." (525). *Money Lender.* Five-for-sixer, loan monger, loan shark, loan wolf. Spec. cutthroat, Jew, Shylock . . ." (520)

As a critic of Shakespeare notes: "I am not aware that Danish courtiers are still regarded as loquacious Poloniuses or Moors as jealous and murderous as Othellos. The Jews, however, are still looked upon as Shylocks, or, rather, Shylock still stands for the Jews." (H. Sinsheimer, *Shylock,* 17)

Yet the Jewish bourgeoisie has produced a distinct type of perverted writing that whitewashes legal literary anti-Semitism in order to please the Gentile powers. An example is to be found in the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia.* Whereas, as we have seen, non-Jewish reference books accurately describe Shylock as he was actually created by Shakespeare, the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia,* echoing the most eminent Jewish supporters of anti-Semitism, remolds the character of Shylock: "Only the genius of Shakespeare could rise above his time and write that defense of the human quality of the Jew in the third act, when Shylock exclaims, 'Hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, passions?' This is the logical sequence of the famous speech in the first act, when Shylock dwells upon the insults he is compelled to bear: 'For sufferance is the badge of all our tribe; You call me misbeliever, cut-throat dog, And spit upon my Jewish gaberdine.' As one studies the speeches of Shylock, one feels how completely Shakespeare had become Shylock, so that he might more fully express what must have been the innmost secrets of his troubled soul. He towers above his enemies in the demonstration of his right to live and act—and suffer. He dominates the play, and even though balked in his revenge, he gains the sympathy of thinking heroes. Georg Brandes offers an incisive illuminative study of Shylock in his volume on Shakespeare." (IX, 491)

A "Jew" has hands, but Shakespeare made these hands different from those of the Christians. He put a knife in one hand of his "Jew" and a scale in the other and portrayed him as determined to cut a piece of flesh from the living body of a Christian, to make it exactly a pound, the amount the "Jew" bound his Christian victim to give in failure of repayment of a loan. A "Jew" has organs, but Shakespeare presented those organs of an inhuman monster—ears that would not listen to the most touching pleas of mercy, a heart—a *Jewish* heart, as

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Antonio calls it—which could not be softened by any amount of supplication. A "Jew" has passions, but Shakespeare showed to his Christian audience what passions a "Jew" has: greed for money, burning hatred for Christians, savage vindictiveness. Shakespeare made Shylock complain that the Christians called him "cut-throat dog" but at the same time he portrayed Shylock as angered because the good-natured Christian Antonio was reducing the rate of interest thus undermining cut-throat usury, the method of Shylock's acquisition of wealth. Moreover, Shakespeare presented the "Jew" Shylock as a cut-throat in a physical sense too.

The best answer to the "interpretation" offered by the *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* that Shylock demonstrates "his right to live and act" is the record showing that on many occasions the *Merchant of Venice* aroused the spectators against the Jews. Schleswig-Holstein passed a law that the *Merchant of Venice* could not be shown unless Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* was shown the night before to mitigate the effect of Shylock by presenting a Jew in a favorable light. "The law was passed because when 'The Merchant' had been produced alone it was followed by invasions of the Ghetto and massacre of the Jews who lived there." *(J. D. B.* Feb. 7, 1934). It was no accident that Shakespeare's Shylock won "the sympathy of thinking heroes" among the Nazi murderers: "Incitement to mass murder marked the Nazi campaign of propaganda last fall, following Heinrich Himmler's promise to Hitler to make Germany free of all Jews . . . Simultaneously the Propaganda Ministry busied itself with the production of new anti-Semitic films, such as 'Shylock.' " *(American Jewish Year Book,* 1943-4, 236)

For over three centuries ideologists of Christian aristocracy and bourgeoisie have been teaching all classes to regard the chief literary symbol of the Jewry with detestation. "And ev'ry child hates Shylock." (A. Pope, *Moral Essays,* "Epistle I"). Edward N. Calisch has grasped a central feature of the play: "The great wrong that Shakespeare has done the Jewish people, was not in the fact that he fashioned such a character as Shylock, but in the fact that by constantly associating the word 'Jew' with the usury, the cruelty, the vindictiveness and the bloodthirsty vengefulness ascribed to him, by emphasizing at every evil point Shylock's race and religion, he has made him as a type of his people, and his faults as characteristics of his kinsmen. Shakespeare has painted many other villains: Macbeth, King John, Richard III, Iago—has made them murderous, cruel, treacherous and vengeful —yet never did he associate their religious creed with them, and no reproach has ever come through them upon the Christian religion or Christian peoples. The villainies that they executed were individual,—the villainy of Shylock was made to be Jewish." *(The Jew in English Literature,* 75-6)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

5. *Bolshevik Popularization of "Shylock" by Lenin and by Stalin*

Marx greatly admired Shakespeare and all his works: "Marx made Shakespeare, whom he admired without limit, the object of his most thorough study and knew the most insignificant characters in his dramas." (Quoting from Lafargue's *Karl Marx, Personal Recollections* in *Marx and Engels About Art,* Moscow, 1933, R. 205). "My children always read Shakespeare." (Marx to Engels, April 10, 1856, XXII, R. 133). Marx frequently quotes from Shakespeare. In *The Critique of Political Economy* Marx uses Shylock's words: "I stay here on my bond!" (189). In *The Civil War in France* Marx says, "the Prussian Shylock was there with his bond for the keep of half a million of his soldiers on French soil." *(S. W.* II, 484). In *Capital* he has a phrase "The Shylock-clinging to the letter of the law of 1844." (I, 315)

"After Marx had become permanently domiciled in London, English literature took first place, and the tremendous figure of Shakespeare dominated the field, in fact the whole family practiced what amounted practically to a Shakespeare cult. Unfortunately Marx never at any time dealt with Shakespeare's attitude to the great questions of his day." (Mehring, *Karl Marx,* 528). Any criticism of Shakespeare was a shock to Marx, as well as to Engels. "Love for Shakespeare compels Engels even in 1873 to exchange feelings of indignation with Marx 'regarding the badly-smelling thick book on Shakespearomania published by the scoundrel Roderic Benedix.' " (A. Beletsky, *K. Marx, F. Engels and the History of Literature,* Moscow 1934, R. 41)

Shakespeare's anti-Semitism was evidently accepted by Marx and Engels and therefore also by their erudite disciples. Trotsky's followers advertised *The Merchant of Venice:* "Shakespeare—the greatest English dramatist. His works have a general human significance and have been translated into the languages of all civilized peoples. Most famous are his tragedies: . . . The Merchant of Venice . . ." ("Notes," Trotsky, *Wks.* II, Pt I, R. 616)

Lenin throughout the terrible "Brest" pogrom years popularized *The Merchant of Venice:* "Chronologically the first Shakespearean play in Moscow was the *Merchant of Venice* shown in 1917 and in the beginning of 1918 in the Maly Theatre . . . A great part in the work of propagandizing Shakespeare in Leningrad and throughout the entire USSR was performed by the Leningrad Bolshoi Drama Theatre. In its first five years it presented 7 Shakespearean plays: *Macbeth, Much to do About Nothing, King Lir, Merchant of Venice* . . . In the national theatres during the entire period of the Revolution . . . was shown *Shylock* . . ." *(Literaturnaya Gazeta,* Dec. 4, 1935, 4)

Making wide use of the pogromist play, the Bolsheviks covered up Shakespeare's anti-Semitic portrayal of the Jew by imparting to it a "revolutionary" meaning. The verbal pretext was that Shakespeare molded Shylock not as a symbol of Jewry but as a symbol of Capitalism.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

This "explanation" eventually was actually printed in the pseudo-scientific pages of Stalin's official publication. Thus: "Within the domain of criticism there have been prolonged disputes why Shakespeare portrays so ill-looking a figure precisely a Jew. Marx's words that 'the civic society produces the Jew out of its own womb' furnishes the key to the understanding of the image of Shylock. Shakespeare uncovers in him not racial but class features. In Shylock he portrays Capitalism, the force of property over man, the paralyzing power of money." *(Gr. Sov. Enc. "Shakespeare."* LXII, 215)

However, the manner in which the Bolshevik leadership makes use of Shylock shows that they see in him a type of a *character* not a symbol of a social system. Lenin, for example, spoke of "the shrewdness of a Shylock . . ." *(State and Revolution).* And in bourgeois countries the Stalin burocrats, silent about the pseudo-scientific "explanation" of Shylock presented in the Bolshevik Russian language publications, and in line with their practice of pointing out reactionary traits in others while overlooking or concealing the same traits in Bolshevism, "expose" the bourgeois educational authorities: "It is not literary preeminence but latent anti-Semitism on the part of educational authorities that has kept The Merchant of Venice in public school curriculums . . . The Merchant of Venice as literary education comes to little more than a course in anti-Semitism." (Isidor Schneider, *New Masses,* Nov. 4, 1947, 21)

For many years the Stalin Government sent representatives to the annual commemorations of Shakespeare at Stratford-on-Avon, collaborating with the bourgeoisie in perpetuating Shakespeare's anti-Semitism. In 1930 the Stalinists issued the complete works of Shakespeare, including the *Merchant of Venice.* Abroad some Left bourgeois worshippers of Shakespeare gave Stalin a hand by declaring that their hero of Sixteenth Century England was an unconscious *proletarian* writer! "A study of Shakespeare from the Marxian viewpoint is one of the great needs of these troubled days. Such a study is sure to throw much needed light on Shakespeare's popularity and influence in the past two hundred years. But whoever undertakes this task must not go to the extreme of trying to make Shakespeare out to have been a conscious and deliberate 'proletarian writer,'—if he was one (and we think he was), he was so unintentionally. From an article on 'Our dramatic theatres' by Y. Sobolev in the current issue of *The Theatre in the USSR* we quote the following highly suggestive paragraphs: 'It is characteristic, that during the current season the plays of Shakespeare have a considerable place in the Soviet repertory . . . The major tones of Shakespeare are consonant with the tone of the Soviet theatre." *(The Shakespeare Association Bulletin,* 1935, 64)

The Russian, Jewish and other workers in the Bolshevik State were informed by Stalin's flunkeys that Shakespeare became a fellow-traveller helping to create "Socialist culture"! "Shakespeare's works have been shining brightly for more than three centuries in the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

cultural treasure-house of advanced humanity. Marx and Engels were in ecstasy about the great dramatist. Marx called Shakespeare the first among his favorite writers. Shakespeare is known and loved in our country. He is our welcome fellow-traveller in the struggle for Socialist culture." *(Bezbozhnik,* May 1939, 17)

CHAPTER XI.

AN EFFECT OF MARXIST POLITICS: THE MURDER OF SIX MILLION MEMBERS OF THE JEWISH SCAPEGOAT

1. *Preparation For the Greatest Extermination of Jews in History*

THE SLAUGHTER of the Jews caused by Lenin's Brest policy was pale by comparison with the subsequent mass extermination of Jews brought on through the policies of Stalin, Trotsky and Social Democracy. Hitler murdered six million Jews, more than all the preceding butchers of the Jewish Scapegoat put together. Hitler and his Nazis did not act independently. They were assigned by the international bourgeoisie to seize upon the traditional Scapegoat as a means of reorganizing the life of Germany. The groundwork for this had been laid years before establishment of the Nazi regime. One of the parts of the Defamation extensively used by the Nazi propagandists was: The Jews caused Germany's defeat in the War of 1914-1918. This concoction had been introduced by Kaiser Wilhelm's generals long before the world heard of Hitler: "In 1916 when Germany realized that the victory she dreamed would never come true and the discontent of the populace became audible, the Prussian Minister of War had taken a census of the Jews to determine their number at the front and their occupation behind the lines. It was a blow which would have shattered the morale of a group less fanatically patriotic than the German Jews. And as the conflict dragged to its close, the High Command—notably Major-General Count von der Schulenberg—suggested that 'the report be spread that the Jews have betrayed the country and sold the people to the enemy.' The legend of 'Jewish defeatism' and of a Jewish 'international conspiracy' against Germany which ran like wildfire through the beaten discouraged land was given an official seal by General Ludendorff, when he was still considered sane, in his book *Kriegsfuhrung und Politik* ('War leadership and Politics,' 1922)." (Lowenthal, 332). The *American Jewish Year Book* for 1918-1919 shows that in December 1918 the "*Frankfurter Zeitung* reports active preparations by anti-Semitic organizations for strong anti-Jewish campaign after the war. A work entitled 'A Knife for the Jews' is distributed in hundreds of thousands of copies." (243). "Maximilian Harden, the famous editor of the 'Zukunft,' in an address delivered in Berlin recently spoke about

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the alarming increase of anti-Semitic propaganda in Germany . . ." (*Jewish Exponent,* Dec. 13, 1918)

Under the Socialist-bourgeois democratic Austrian Government the Defamers equated the Jews, Bolshevism and bourgeois democracy: "The Jew is coming up as a world ruler. The countries like Russia, Germany and Austria are already ruled by the Jews openly and the Jews are the leaders of the people. Soon other countries will also follow this leadership and Judaism will spread over the whole world its banner, the banner of Jerusalem." (*Vienna Telegraf,* March 9, 1920)

The falsehood that the Bolshevik Revolution was a seizure of power by the Jews, pounded into the heads of the German masses by Hitler, was originated by Russian White Guards and supported by the bourgeois democracies. The Liberal British Government headed by Lloyd George spread the deception that Lenin's Russian-nationalist dictatorship was Jewish and that the world was in imminent danger from the Jewish Peril! On September 6, 1918 the Netherland Minister in Petrograd, Oudendyk, sent a report to Sir M. Findlay in Christiania who forwarded it to Balfour. The British Government published the report in a White Paper, Russia, #1, April 1919. It said in part: "I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the War which is still raging, and unless as above stated, Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately, it is bound to spread, in one form or another, over Europe and the whole world, AS it is organized and worked by JEWS, who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things. The only manner in which this danger could be averted would be collective action on the part of all Powers." (6). "People have been arrested for a simple telephonic conversation, in which the terms seemed ambigious or could be interpreted as adverse to the Bolsheviks. An arrest is a prelude to every kind of corruption; the rich have to pay huge exactions to intermediaries, who are usually Jews, before they can obtain their release." (65)

Immediately after the War of 1914-1918 the German bourgeoisie made great use of a Black Hundred work known as the *Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion* written in 1905 by Sergei Nilus a Russian professor. The "Protocols" supposedly represented conclusive evidence of the existence of a world-wide Jewish plot to overthrow all governments and to replace them with a powerful brutal and avaricious despotism of the Jews—a Jewish world state. The "Protocols" had originally been printed by the Tsar's private press at Tsarskoe Selo. They were eventually exposed as forgeries (London *Times,* August 16, 17, 18, 1921; *The New York Times,* Sep. 4, 1921). This, however, did not prevent the Defamers from making further use of them. The "Protocols" were subsequently translated into French, German, English, Italian, Danish, Swedish, Polish, Hungarian and "were also translated into Arabic and were circulated in Egypt, Palestine, Syria

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and Persia." (H. Bernstein, *The Truth About 'The Protocols of Zion'*, 46). The "Protocols" were spread in Algeria, South Africa, China, Japan, virtually throughout the entire globe. "The first German text, included in a voluminous work *Die Geheimnisse der Weisen von Zion* ('The Secrets of the Sages of Zion'), was first published in 1919 by Guttfried Zur Beck, alias Captain Muller von Hausen. Prince Otto Salm and Count Behr, the latter a leader in the Conservative Party, raised large sums for its distribution. Gentlemen of the peerage undertook vigorous propaganda in its behalf, especially in the rural districts of which they were the overlords. Prince Joachim Albrecht of Prussia handed out copies to the valets and waiters of the hotels and restaurants he frequented. Ex-Kaiser William II consoled himself by reading chapters from it to his visitors in Dorn. The conservative press used it for endless editorial reflections. It was soon called 'the people's Bible.' " (Lowenthal, 339-40)

After Hitler took power the *Protocols* became required reading in German schools.

2. *The Stalin Marxists Support Nazi Anti-Semitic Ideology and Policy*

Elsewhere we have given evidence that Stalin with Trotsky's "critical" support attempted to hasten the advent of the Nazi pogromists to power (Red Referendum). We may add that Stalin helped Hitler to strengthen the anti-Semitic ideology among the masses. For example, a Comintern burocrat, Willi Muenzenberg, editor of the Stalin daily paper *Welt am Abend* told the workers: "On the editorial board of the *Welt am Abend* there is today not one single Jew." (August 4, 1931). The Stalin Party published a pamphlet by one of its members named Sheringer which boasted that there were no Jews on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany. Stalin's German burocrats aided Hitler to pass an anti-Semitic measure in the Prussian Landtag on June 24-25, 1932: "An alliance of National Socialists and their mortal enemies the Communists, made possible the passage in the new Prussian Diet, in June 1932, of a law instructing the Government to submit the draft of a law providing for the confiscation of the property of East European Jews who entered the country after August 1, 1914." (*Am. Jewish Year Book*, Oct. 1932-Sept. 1933). "The Nazis supported by the Communist fraction had this law adopted contrary to the most elementary rules of justice and the consequence of which are difficult to foresee. The most important passage of the law states: 'All the property of all Jews originating from Eastern Europe, which has been obtained in Germany since August 1, 1914, shall be confiscated, since it represents the dishonest accumulation of wealth by a race which produces nothing, and which lives at the expense of the German nation reduced to slavery. The Prussian government shall be required to submit within a period of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

three weeks a project which will provide for the use of the confiscated funds for the alleviation of unemployment." (*Ar. Isr.* July 21, 1932, 144)

3. *Social Democrats Marxists Aid Nazi Anti-Semitism*

The Right German Socialists who were to come to power after the fall of the Kaiser manifested anti-Semitism during the War, as reported by a Jewish bourgeois paper: "German Majority Socialists as Anti-Semites. *Die Internationale Correspondenz,* the official publication of the German Majority Socialists, printed an attack on the Minority Socialists, for having included two Jews among their five delegates who have visited Stockholm. The *Leipziger Volkzeitung* replied with a bitter complaint against the anti-Semitic outburst of the Majority organ and blamed it for fostering race hatred." (*Jewish Chronicle,* Sept. 28, 1917)

The Right Marxist Social Democratic regime of the Weimar Republic of Germany shaped its policies to meet the requirements of the German bourgeoisie. It allowed an anti-Semitic policy in various official agencies. For example: "On the basis of the Law for the Defense of the Republic, the court of Gotha sentenced four people on March 13, 1923, to three months imprisonment for public abuse expressed in the words: 'We do not need a Jewish republic, we spit on the Jewish republic.' Upon appeal of the convicted men, the Imperial Court reversed the sentence on June 22 of the same year . . . Making a sophistical distinction between the Weimar Constitution and its application in real life, the court refused to defend the republic and encouraged its enemies. The practice of the Weimar courts knows of other cases when republican judges acquitted defamers and sanctioned anti-Semitic propaganda." (M. Vishniak, *An International Convention Against Anti-semitism,* 73)

At one time, specifically at the height of the 1923 revolutionary crisis, the Socialist Government of Ebert for three days winked at a pogrom in Berlin: "Unquestionably, the most shameful incident of the year was the disturbances in Berlin early in November, 1923, which lasted three days. On November 5, 1923, about 10,000 unemployed assembled in the front of the Labor Office to receive their 'doles.' About 11 o'clock of that day, word came that there was no money to dole out. Speakers belonging to the monarchists and anti-Semitic Deutschvoelkische Partei, taking advantage of the situation, addressed the crowds and called upon them to plunder Jewish shops. One hour later, well organized bands, made up largely by youths invaded the streets in the center of the city. With nightfall the disorders gained in intensity and spread to other parts of the city. The 'pogrom' was resumed on the following day with Deuschvoelkische speakers everywhere inciting the crowds to 'pogrom the Jewish population.' The police finally restored order and later the Government appointed a commission to investigate the disorders and to submit estimates of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the losses sustained by the victims." (*American Jewish Year Book,* 1924-1925, 108-109)

After the Berlin pogrom and the betrayal of the proletarian revolution by the Trio-Trotsky "Workers Governments," agencies of the Socialist Ebert regime indirectly aided Nazi propaganda against the Jews: "In a decision of acquittal the Amtsgericht (court) of Wernigerode of March 6, 1924, declared: 'The German people recognize more and more that Jewry bears the heaviest guilt for our misfortune. This is understood by ever-widening circles of the population. We cannot think of the rebirth of our people before we break the power of Jewry.'" (M. Vishniak, 74)

In 1929 the Nazis instigated a ritual murder trial in Bamberg; in 1930 Blood Accusations occurred at Coburg, Cologne, and Nuremberg. The charges were dismissed and the instigators were given token punishment. But the fact that ritual murder cases were permitted by the Liberal-Socialist regime to be brought up for official hearing in the bourgeois democratic judicial halls of the State indicated to the backward masses, inflamed against the Jews, that the Blood Accusation *as such* was not entirely devoid of authenticity.

Contrary to the general belief, anti-Jewish terror began in Germany long before Hitler was placed in power. By 1931, under the protective wing of Social Democratic and bourgeois democratic government the Nazis had official anti-Semitism injected into the schools and legislatures: "Jews are being beaten; synagogues defaced; cemeteries desecrated; Jewish stores boycotted; and Jewish employees thrown out of the country's economic life . . . In the Province of Thuringia, a special clause was inserted into the prayer of school children, calling on the Divine Power to rid Germany of the 'alien races.' . . . The Anti-Shechita laws now being debated in the various legislatures and in the press are another symptom of misdirected humane impulses, lavished on dumb animals and fed on Jewish blood instead." (Dr. J. Tenenbaum, *Economic Anti-Semitism,* 1931, 7-8)

The Nazis compared the Jews to fleas: "'To be sure, the Jew is human. No one has ever doubted it. The flea too is an animal—though not a pleasant one. And since the flea is not a pleasant creature we have no bounden duty to shelter and protect it, to allow it to thrive so it may bite and hurt and torment us. Instead we put it out of the way. The same should hold for the Jews.'" (Goebbels, *Der Nazi-Sozi,* Munich 1932; cited by Konrad Heiden, *The New Inquisition,* 180-1; also by Senator J. T. Robinson in U. S. Senate, June 10, 1933)

The Nazi remarks cited above recall to mind Marx's complaint that in Ramsgate there were "many Jews and fleas."

When the Nazis made tremendous gains in the July 1932 elections and it appeared that they would soon become the governing party in Germany, the Social Democrats were requested by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency to state what action they would take if the Nazis

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

formed a government and attacked the Jews. "The Social Democratic Party which in the last Reichstag was the largest single party, with 143 Deputies against the Hitlerite 107, and which now has 133, making also the largest party in the new Reichstag, made an official statement to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency in which it says: 'The attitude of the Social Democratic Party on the race question, and especially on the question of the equality of the Jews as citizens, should be known to the whole world and to public opinion everywhere. Of course, we do not in the least subscribe to the views of the Nazis on this question. As to what the Party will do should there be a Nazi government in the Reich which will proceed to carry its program against the Jews into effect is something that cannot be answered now. It is not possible to say beforehand what we would do in such a case.'" *(Jewish Daily Bulletin,* August 12, 1932)

This was sheer evasion. One of the leaders of German Social Democracy, Severing, knowing full well that the Nazi program was to attack the Jews, and that it was already being applied, had openly declared only a few weeks earlier: "If National Socialism demonstrates in deed that it is capable of doing fruitful work, the Social Democratic Party of Germany will not refuse it recognition." (Speech in Nienburg, July 3, 1932)

Meanwhile anti-Semitic poison coursed through the ranks of the German Socialist membership: "Even the Jewish circles sympathizing with the Socialists are somewhat confused. In the ranks of the Socialist workers there is a rather violent agitation against the Jewish manufacturers, who are said to understand better than the others how to exploit the latest emergency decrees and to oppress the workers. The anti-Semitic poison is beginning to penetrate more and more into the rank and file of the Social Democratic Party." *(Jewish Chr.* Oct. 28, 1932, 20)

On November 2, 1932 the leaders of German Social Democracy resorted to the old trick of shamefaced anti-Semites: "All the Socialist papers today carry a declaration of the Party's attitude toward the Jews. The statement says that the Party is neither pro-Semitic nor anti-Semitic and that it is not wooing the Jewish vote." *(J. D. B.,* Nov. 4, 1932). Any political movement which shirks from defense of the Scapegoat is not neutral; it is an anti-Semitic movement in a "neutrality" disguise.

A large section of Austrian Social Democracy aided the Hitler anti-Semitic propaganda in Germany and in Austria. The Jewish bourgeois press, which, as a rule, was cool, sometimes hostile, toward the Bolshevik Marxists, but friendly toward Social Democracy, reported in 1929: "Anti-Semitism Spreads in Austrian Socialist Democrat Circles . . . Vienna—Nov. 25. Anti-Semitism is growing stronger here with Austrian Socialist Democrats disturbing Jews in Socialist Democratic Party districts. Eight of these districts have unanimously adopted protest resolutions demanding that the Socialist Democratic

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Party Executive clarify the Jewish question. This is the first time that the Jewish problem is being debated within the Austrian Socialist Party. The labor newspaper, 'Sport-Montag,' continues its fight against the campaign to expel Jews from Socialist organizations. The paper expresses the fear that the majority party will not take up the fight against anti-Semitism." *(Ib.* Nov. 26, 1929). The Austrian Social Democrats aided the Hitler party in Austria by introducing anti-Semitic measures such as, ". . . the motion of the Social Democrats for the confiscation of the properties of the House of Rothschild." *(Ib.* Nov. 14, 1932)

Research indicates that anti-Semitism within Austrian Social Democracy was really an old story. Signs of the virus appeared as far back as the Nineteenth Century. In 1897 a report from Vienna stated: "Even among the Social Democrats there is an influential section which objects to Jews holding positions of trust in the party." *(Jewish Chr.,* Nov. 12, 1897)

Jewish Social Democracy the world over concealed the anti-Semitic manifestations in Social Democracy and kept reassuring the Jewish workers regarding the threat of massacres of the Jews by the Nazis. Even after Hitler was given power by Hindenburg, the Jewish Social Democrats took the position—similar to that of Trotsky's—that the old Prussian aristocrat would be no aid to Hitler: "Hindenburg's authority will help the Hitlerites precious little in this case, for everybody knows that Hindenburg has not become a Nazi. He designated Hitler as Chancellor because Hitler represents the largest party in the country. But he has not given him the slightest dictatorial power." *(Forward,* Feb. 3, 1933)

4. *A Left Liberal Socialist Ritual Murder Case in Czechoslovakia—Support to Hitler*

While the Gentile and Jewish Marxists—Stalinists, Trotskyites, Socialists—enveloped the advanced workers of Europe and the rest of the world with a fog of deception, a dark anti-Semitic atrocity was being perpetrated in one of the most democratic of all bourgeois countries. Czechoslovakia was governed by a famous near-Marxist Professor Thomas Masaryk, the founder of the Czech State. Officially, Masaryk was opposed to anti-Semitism and seemed very friendly to the Jews. "In an interview on the occasion of his seventy-eighth birthday with the editor of the leading Czech newspaper *Ludowe Noviny,* Thomas Masaryk, President for life of Czechoslovakia, said: 'When I was a child I feared the Jews, believing that they used Christian blood for Passover. This fear was the result of the frightful murder tales which were told by my mother. Since hearing these tales I always avoided Jews and Jewish children. Jewish children sought my company in play, as I understood German, but I always ran away from them. It was only when I attended *real-schule* that I reconciled myself

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

somewhat to the presence of Jews.'" (M. Hunterberg, *Jesus, the Crucified Jew,* 22-3; *J. D. B.,* March 11, 1928). In another passage Masaryk admitted the depth of his childhood conviction regarding the Blood Accusation: "The superstition of Christian blood used for Passover cakes had become so much part and parcel of my existence that whenever I chanced to come near a Jew—I wouldn't do it on purpose—I would look at his fingers to see if no blood were there. For a long time I continued this practice . . ." *(Hebrew Standard,* May 7, 1920; *Besedy Gasu,* Feb. 24, 1911; K. Capek, *President Masaryk Tells His Story;* J. L. Baron, *Stars and Sand,* 371)

Yet, despite the fact that in 1920 Masaryk said the Blood Accusation was superstition, his Government from 1930 to 1932 conducted a gruesome Blood Accusation case. Nor is this all. At the head of the Czechoslovak Ministry of Justice stood a *Jewish Marxist!*

"Blood Libel in Czechoslovakia—Professor Masaryk's Silence— Incredible though it may sound, it is yet a fact that in the country of which Professor Masaryk is President and a Jewish Socialist, Dr. Meissner, is Minister of Justice, a blood-libel case has been dragging on for fifteen months and no attempt is being made to put an end to the disgraceful proceedings. Professor Masaryk, whose great fight against the Hilsner blood-libel is still remembered, abstains from interference, probably 'in the interest of justice.' Dr. Meissner, himself a Jew, is probably afraid to act boldly, because he is anxious to avoid creating an impression that he brought undue pressure in favor of Jews. The Government, as a whole, and the judicial authorities, particularly, have allowed a ritual murder case to go on ever since 1930, even though the charge of 'drawing blood' remains as unsubstantiated as it is intrinsically fantastic.

"The two Jewish pedlars, Lieberman and Steinberger—accused of having drawn blood for ritual purposes from two Christian children at Velka-Berezna, Carpatho-Russia, are still under police supervision. For months previously they had languished in prison. After many adjournments, demanded by the prosecution, the case was fixed to take place on December 14, but to the great surprise of all concerned, the proceedings were again postponed, even though the defense protested. It is interesting that the State prosecutor has not yet submitted any medical evidence to show that there were any signs of the blood having been drawn.

"The Jewish deputies, having failed to induce the Government to quash the case, have now decided to raise the question in parliament. They will attack both the Jewish Minister of Justice and the Minister of Defense, whose officials take a seeming delight in making as much of the case as possible and are conducting the investigations with so much publicity and unfairness." *(Jewish Chr.,* Jan. 8, 1932, 16-17)

At length the case against the two framed Jews was dropped, the court, however, refused to clear them completely: "Prague, March

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

21. The Velkaberezna court today dismissed the appeal for Steinberg and Lieberman for a full acquittal on charges of having attempted to draw the blood of two Christian children for ritual purposes. Following this action a formal appeal for a retrial was entered. The case . . . was dismissed last week for lack of evidence . . . the effect of the anti-Jewish propaganda caused by this incident remain . . ." *(J.D.B.* March 22, 1932). Be it remembered that 1930-1932 were the most crucial years for the Nazi propagandists in their fierce labors to gather mass support to Hitler's anti-Semitic platform. A little over three years later, Masaryk, who had witnessed in his long life hundreds of bloody massacres of the Jews, deceitfully asserted that anti-Semitism did not injure the Jews in a material way. "Speaking on anti-Semitism, Professor Masaryk recently said 'It is a sore upon the body of humanity. It harms and demoralizes people and makes them raw. Materially it does not harm the Jews. At most it may harm them morally in the negative sense only, insofar as it makes them sharpen their wits to overcome anti-Semitism socially and religiously." *(J. D. B.,* March 7, 1935). In the same issue of the *Jewish Daily Bulletin* it is recorded that, closing their eyes to the true character of Masaryk, the Jewish bourgeoisie performed their usual act of bootlicking: "Czechoslovakian Jewry and Jews throughout the world will join the entire Czechoslovakian nation in honoring Professor Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first president of the Czechoslovakian Republic, on the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday today." And in the next issue: "Palestine Hails 85th Birthday of T. G. Masaryk. Mass Meetings, Prayers at Wailing Wall for Czech President." *(J. D. B.,* March 8, 1935)

5. *Bolshevik and Social Democratic Legal Protection to Nazi Murderers*

The openly pogromist Hitler regime received full recognition from the anti-Semitic Stalin burocracy, the anti-Semitic bourgeois governments and the anti-Semitic Social Democratic regimes.

In April 1933, when Hitler's anti-Jewish violence burst with fury, Ramsay MacDonald, one of the most respected leaders in the Second International and the leading figure in the British Labor Party, was asked to express his position on the Nazi terror in Germany: "The Prime Minister of Great Britain, J. Ramsay MacDonald, who arrived here yesterday to take up with President Roosevelt the economic world problems, declined to discuss the question of the Nazi persecution in Germany . . . But he arose from his chair and was seemingly uneasy when the representative of the Jewish Telegraphic Agency put the following question to him:

" 'Do you, Mr. Prime Minister, condemn the anti-Semitic policy of the Nazi Government of Germany?'

" 'Oh-o-o,' Mr. MacDonald exclaimed, apparently surprised. 'Well,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

you probably know that I came here to talk about other matters than these,' . . .

"On the tug the Prime Minister again was asked about his attitude toward the present situation in Germany.

" 'It is a lovely day to day,' he retorted." *(J. D. B.,* April 23, 1933, 1). The Jewish bourgeoisie arrived at a unanimous view on MacDonald: "There is, however, no controversy in Jewish circles, on the significance of the role played by Mr. Ramsay MacDonald in Jewish affairs. He was known to the Jews as a staunch opponent of anti-Semitism . . ." *(American Hebrew,* Nov. 26, 1937, 9)

In October, 1936, the French Socialist Premier Leon Blum, who had been placed in power by the Stalin-Socialist Popular Front, declared to a Nazi emissary: "I am a Jew, I am a Marxist, and that is the reason I all the more ardently desire that our countries should be able to live together on good terms." (Cited in *Congress Weekly,* March 20, 1942, 4). In the same period the German Stalinist Party made an appeal to the Hitler murderers: "Nazi Brothers! . . . Let us reach out our hands to each other and unite!" (From the Manifesto of the German Communist Party, *Deutsche Volks-Zeitung,* Oct. 18, 1936)

Hypocritical Marxism extended its Right and its Left hand of friendship and legality to the Hitler bandits in all spheres of politics. Litvinov, a Jewish Bolshevik, who was to Stalin what the Jewish bourgeois Dr. Margolin had been to Petlura, asked Nazi Germany to reenter the League of Nations: "In common with the other members of the League we sincerely regret the incompleteness of the League and the absence from it of some great countries, particularly in Europe. We shall welcome the return into that midst of Hitler's Germany . . ." *(Daily Worker,* March 19, 1936)

The Nazis began their preparations for the complete extermination of all the Jews in their domain during their closest relations with the Bolshevik Marxists. (The Stalin-Hitler Pact, Aug. 24, 1939—June 22, 1941)

When Lenin shook hands with the representatives of the Polish and Ukrainian pogromist regimes, those regimes at least provided the Bolshevik burocracy with a figleaf by disclaiming responsibility for the pogroms carried out by Pilsudsky's and Petlura's troops. Stalin and Molotov possessed no such figleaf with respect to the Nazis. For the first time in the history of Capitalism there existed an open, legal, official pogromist regime which made it a duty for "Aryans" to torture and kill Jews. This regime provided Jewish children as targets in shooting exercises of the Nazi youth. It issued orders to the leaders of Jewish community to deliver Jewish girls to Nazi barracks—to which orders, by way, the Jewish leaders and the girls replied with suicides. And while these horrors were being perpetrated by the Nazis, Stalin and Molotov shook hands with Joachim von Ribbentrop, Hitler's Foreign Minister. In December 1939, Ribbentrop

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sent Stalin a friendly message: "Remembering those historic hours in the Kremlin, I beg you to accept my warmest congratulations on your 60th birthday." To which Stalin replied: "The friendship of the peoples of Germany and of the Soviet Union, cemented by blood, will long remain firm."

Stalin's friendly relations with the Nazis were acclaimed by every burocrat in the Stalin camp, including the Jews from M. J. Olgin and Michael Gold up. And it was finally Hitler, not Stalin, who broke the diplomatic and economic friendship between the Marxist State and bourgeois pogromist Germany.

The Social Democratic Marxists denounced Stalin for concluding the Pact but kept silent about their comrade Per Albin Hansson, the Socialist Premier of Sweden, maintaining close diplomatic and economic relations with Hitler. Swedish Social Democracy enjoyed the largest representation in the Riksdag and in fact was the ruling power in Sweden. Hansson permitted the Swedish Nazis to operate in his country as a legal force. He accommodated Hitler by placing at his disposal the service of the Swedish railways for transporting Nazi war materials and troops. Some bourgeois democrats attempted to excuse Hansson by arguing that had he denied the Nazis the railway service they would have pulverized Sweden. However, when in 1943 the indignant Swedish workers demanded that Hansson put a stop to his policy, he did, although the Nazis were still strong enough to bombard Sweden. "Beginning in August the government took action which the people had been demanding for months: On Aug. 15, the transportation of war materials for the Germans to Norway and Finland on Swedish railways was stopped; on Aug. 20, the leave transit of German troops and the use of Swedish lines for transit between Trondhjem and Narvik was forbidden." (*Britannica Book of the Year, 1944,* 679). The leadership of Swedish Social Democracy did not sever relations with the Nazis until May 7, 1945, that is, until Hitler had mysteriously vanished and his regime was in dissolution. This means that the Second International, through Per Albin Hansson and Gustav Moeller, Minister of Social Affairs in his Cabinet and a representative of Swedish Social Democracy to the Second International, had contact with the Nazis not only after the "democratic" imperialists had broken all official relations with them but during the entire period of the Nazi atrocities.

6. *The Jewish Bourgeoisie in its Usual Role of Aiding Anti-Semitism*

While Marxism kept the proletariat from independent class action which could have saved the doomed Jews as well as many other victims, the Jewish bourgeoisie in Germany and elsewhere performed its traditional role of giving aid to the Defamers and pogromists, in this instance to the Nazis. This assistance was in various forms.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Some of the Jewish bourgeoisie embraced Christianity and became active anti-Semitic propagandists. Thus, "Adolph Hitler's aide and acting editor of the Voelkischer Beobachter, the chief Hitlerite organ, is a converted Jew . . ." *(J. D. B.,* March 2, 1931). Part of the revenue of the Nazi pogromist press was provided by Jewish capitalists through advertising: "The advertising placed by Paramount Company, whose executives are Adolph Zukor, Jesse Lasky, Sam Katz, Emanuel Cohen and I. Blumenthal have enabled the Nazi publication which formerly appeared fortnightly, to make its appearance weekly." *(Ib.* Sept. 9, 1932). A few weeks after the above news was printed, a report arrived stating that—"Officials of the Paramount Company have withdrawn their advertisements following criticism from Jewish circles, in the opinion of leaders of the Central Union of German Citizens of the Jewish faith. While the Paramount Company is conspicuous by its absence from the advertising columns of the Nazi organ, another equally important film company, that of Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, whose executives, too, are Jews, utilizes the advertising columns of the Nazi paper." *(Ib.* Oct. 4, 1932, 3)

Jewish bankers in America and Europe participated in almost all the large international financial investments in Nazi German economy, thus helping to create a powerful Hitler Germany. Meanwhile Jewish bourgeois journalists and "thinkers," ignoring the spreading anti-Semitic plague in the Weimar Republic, were allaying the uneasiness of the world Jewish population: "Despite these unmistakable symptoms of a universally recognized disease, the *American Jewish Year Book* for 1929 concludes with the comment that 'the past year witnessed a practical cessation of all anti-Jewish propaganda.' While the election returns in Germany in September 1930 were disturbing still they seem to have aroused no more serious apprehension than the continued pattern of anti-Semitic incidents in the United States. 'While several Jewish organizations in the United States were deeply stirred by the results of the German election,' reads the *Year Book* 'they took no action, knowing that the sister community in Central Europe is well able to deal with the situation.' " (Carey McWilliams, 39). "We are living in a new age which manifests a more tolerant and more humane attitude toward inter-group relations." *(Jewish Social Service Quarterly,* Sept. 1930, I, 15)

The Jewish bourgeois "sister community" in Germany calmed the Jewish workers and the Jewish capitalists, doing all it could to deaden their vigilance: "The results of the elections caused a veritable panic among some Jewish groups in Germany, and a number left the country; the exodus from Bavaria was greatest. That there was no reason for such hysteria was the view of Jewish leaders, including Professor Albert Einstein, who pointed out that the huge increase in the votes for the Nazis, did not indicate a corresponding growth of anti-Semitism but was rather a symptom of despair in the face of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

depressed economic conditions and unemployment." *(Amer. J. Y. B.,* Sept. 1931–Sept. 1932)

The President of the German Republic was an old Prussian aristocrat who in an interview admitted that he had enforced the anti-Semitic rules in the Kaiser's Army: "The Imperial military rules and regulations, which were discriminatory to the Jews of our country, were not drawn up by me. As a subordinate to the high military command, I had to abide by these laws, of course." *(Amer. Jewish World,* June 29, 1928). The "democratic" President was an honorary member of the Fascist Stahlhelm. *(J. D. B.,* Sept. 22, 1931). But the Jewish bourgeois journalists, unable to comprehend the democracy-Fascism manipulations, viewed von Hindenburg as a "friend of the Jews" and a "defender of democracy"! Following the April 1932 elections a Jewish bourgeois magazine went into ecstasies about Von Hindenburg's "victory" over Hitler: "Now with von Hindenburg again at the helm of affairs the Jews can certainly expect better treatment. Von Hindenburg has proved himself to be a strong ruler and a friend of the Jews. From news at hand he is already taking severe action and has started a war against the Nazis. Many of their conspiracies have been nipped in the bud and Germany can now be sure that her affairs are entrusted to capable hands. We offer our felicitations to von Hindenburg and pray that he may be spared to guide Germany for many years to come." *(Jewish Advocate,* Bombay, May 1932, 390-391)

The Nazis, of course, had a precise understanding of Hindenburg's policy and made their attitude toward him quite clear. A short while after Hindenburg was felicitated by the Jews. "Many thousands of National Socialists . . . acclaimed President von Hindenburg, shouting, 'Heil Hindenburg . . .' " *(N. Y. T.,* June 1, 1932)

A section of the Jewish bourgeoisie, confident that Hindenburg would safeguard "democracy," was openly assisting the Nazis for business reasons: "The Central Union leaders reported as a shameful fact that Jews advertise in the Nazi press for the purpose of attracting Nazi customers. In Hamburg, it was revealed, a candy factory owned by a Jew, manufactures candy with a Nazi emblem." *(J. D. B.,* July 7, 1932, 2)

There were unmistakable signs that the entire German bourgeoisie had gone over to an anti-Semitic program. Even the "non-anti-Semitic" bourgeois-democratic party of the Center headed by Dr. Heinrich Bruning, Chancellor from March 29, 1930 to May 1932 and supported by a large section of the Jewish population, revealed its true nature: "Center Party Refuses Jews on Lists: Regrets Ever Sanctioning Jewish Candidate." *(Ib.* July 27, 1932, 1). But the Jewish bourgeois leaders, like the Marxists, ignored virtually every sign denoting that the German bourgeoisie had decided to overcome the critical political-economic situation by egging the masses on against the Jews. Among numerous delusions, the Jewish bourgeois leaders harbored the naive belief that the Nazis would fear *world opinion,*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

one of the mythical "protections" the Jewish Scapegoat had tragically relied upon for generations: "The Central Union leaders declared that seven members of the cabinet are not Nazis and thus outweigh three enemies of the Jews whom the cabinet does contain. Even the Nazis will hesitate before carrying out actual excesses against the Jews, the Central Union holds, because they will consider the impression created abroad, particularly on Mussolini who opposes anti-Semitism." *(Ib.* Feb. 1, 1933, 1)

We shall give two citations which further illustrate the singular blindness, or perhaps the wishful thinking, of the Jewish bourgeois leaders: "When, in February 1932, announcement was made that Hitler himself would be the Nazi candidate for President, in opposition to Marshal von Hindenburg, the Jews and the Liberal elements carried on a vigorous campaign for the latter, who was elected on the run-off balloting on April 13, 1932." *(A. J. Y. B.,* Oct. 1932-Sept. 1933, 56). ". . . President von Hindenburg appointed Hitler to the Chancellorship." *(Ib.* Sept. 1933-Sept. 1934, 24)

The religious German Jews, with their heads completely in the clouds, had prayed ardently for Hindenburg's health just a few months before he turned them over to the Nazi hangmen: "The 2nd Day of Rush-Hasanna special prayers were said in all the synagogues of Germany for Marshall Hindenburg, President of the Republic, on the occasion of his 85th birthday." *(Arch. Isr.,* Oct. 13, 1932, 162)

In the first months of Hitler's power savage attacks upon individual Jews assumed gigantic proportions. The German Jewish bourgeois leaders strove to hide this fact from the world outside: "Reports in the foreign press of atrocities suffered by German Jews at the hands of the Nazis were branded as 'pure inventions' in a statement issued at Berlin by the Central Union of German Citizens of the Jewish Faith." (March 24, 1933. *World Almanac* for 1934, 98)

After Hitler's regime opened the most devastating anti-Jewish campaign in history, a group within the German Jewish bourgeoisie, to win his favor, attacked refugee Jews who had fled the country and were denouncing Hitler: "The Union of Nationalist German Jews issues a statement condemning several prominent German-Jewish writers who plan to publish an anti-Nazi periodical in Holland, blaming these men for the troubles the Jews now endure in Germany, and calling them 'cowardly runaways.' " *(A. J. Y. B.,* Sept. 1934-Sept. 1935, 157-8)

When the man who had given the Nazi hangman administrative powers died, the German Jewish bourgeoisie sent condolences to the Hitler regime: "The Berlin Jewish community yesterday held special services for von Hindenburg in all synagogues. Today a memorial meeting in honor of the aged soldier was held by the Association of Jewish Front Soldiers. Messages of condolence were sent to Colonel Oskar von Hindenburg, son and aide-de-camp of the Reichpresident by the Association of Jewish Communities of Prussia and the Berlin

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Jewish Community. The latter also addressed a message of condolence to the Reich government." (*J. D .B.* Aug. 6, 1934, 1)

Former Social Democratic police chief of Berlin recorded: "There were, for instance, the German Jewish Nationalists under the leadership of Max Naumann and numbering several tens of thousands. These Jews were more nationalistic than the Germans themselves and often more reactionary than the most outspoken reactionary and anti-Semite. At the end of 1934, Max Naumann gave the leading Catholic French newspaper, La Croix, an interview which testified eloquently to the illusions and utter reactionary views held by him and his friends. Naumann, asked whether it was true that he approved of Nazism and Hitler's anti-Semitic policy, answered: 'That is not entirely true. We would have considered it a national disaster for Germany and for us Jewish nationalists, who are among the best of Germany's sons, if Hitler had not taken the fate of the German people in his hands. Hitler is our destiny. Only he can solve the Jewish problem.' " (A. C. Grzesinski, *Inside Germany,* 195-6)

No one, we believe, summed up more tersely the position of the German Jewish bourgeoisie towards Hitler than Dr. Fritz Schlesinger, a Liberal Jewish bourgeois leader, who declared, "We have not rejected the Nazi flag, the flag has rejected us." (Cited in *Militant,* Nov. 4, 1933)

7. *The Polish, the Jewish Marxists and Stalin during the Extermination of Jews by Hitler*

In the Winter of 1942-1943 the wholesale destruction of the Jews of Europe by the Nazis entered the extreme and final stage. The Nazis chose Poland as the center of the extermination. The Polish bourgeoisie and Social Democracy had organized an underground struggle ostensibly for the liberation of the entire population of Poland from the Nazi murderers. This struggle was clothed with bourgeois democratic phrases of freedom, of equality for all. It is of interest therefore to see what their attitude was toward the Jewish section of Poland's population.

Anti-Semitism had been rooted in the Polish aristocracy for centuries; the Polish bourgeoisie remained true to the anti-Jewish spirit of the aristocracy and for years prior to the advent of Hitler Poland was the leading anti-Semitic sector in the world. Before the Nazi invasion (Sep. 1939) the Polish rulers had established a united front with Hitler in persecuting the Jews. "Poland had Colonel Beck as Foreign Minister collaborating with the Nazis and introducing anti-Jewish measures. The leader of the government party, Kowalewski, wrote to the 'Volkischer Beobachter' (5/10/37) approving the cause of the German minorities in Poland, and saying 'For us there exists only one difference in the evolution of the people of Poland: Christian and non-Christian. You understand?' " (B. Chapman, *The Compleat*

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Anti-Semite). "The official stand was that the Jews were 'superfluous' aliens and should be eliminated from the Polish body politic . . . In 1937 the minister of education authorized 'ghetto benches' in the classrooms . . . Bloody riots occurred in 1937 . . . a number of anti-Jewish bills, including a ban on Shehita, were introduced into the Sejm elected in November, 1938. It was only the occupation of Prague (in March, 1939) and the resultant international crisis that saved the Jews from being legally deprived of some of their basic civil rights." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* VIII, 573, 574, 576)

Even when the Polish bourgeoisie fell under the bloody Nazi heel, its behavior towards the Jews remained unaltered. Its underground forces were being nurtured on anti-Semitism. The Jewish Bund's paper in America *(The Ghetto Speaks,* October 1, 1942) pointed out this fact: "Part of the underground ONR and OZN press is anti-Semitic as it was before and approves of the extermination policy of the Nazis, simultaneously deprecating their barbarian methods. Another part of the underground press, unfortunately, remains silent about this inhuman and—from the national point of view—injurious anti-Semitic policy."

The chief agency of the Polish bourgeoisie in the proletarian camp was the Socialist Party (P.P.S.). It was passionately chauvinistic and it had an unbroken record of anti-Semitism for many years: "At the same time the P.P.S. becomes an anti-Semitic party . . . Already in his election campaign speech, on December 21, 1918, (Printed in *Naprzod,* organ of the P.P.S.) the leader of the Party, Dashinsky, formulated his attitude toward the Jewish Question: 'In the Polish-Jewish question the conflict between the two nationalities is based on the condition that the Jews in the course of almost centuries did not become Polonized . . . Besides, it is necessary to take into account the fact that the Jews form 13% of the entire population of Poland . . . In every other country, even in England and America, such alien elements would not be tolerated . . . And it must no longer be so here.' " (Heifetz, *World Reaction and Jewish Pogroms,* I. R. 235). During the Polish pogroms of 1918-1919, Dashinsky sent a telegram to the leader of the Swedish Social Democrats, Branting, saying: " 'The pogroms are directed against usurers; unfortunately, here as everywhere, also innocent people were victims.' " (237). In the Polish Sejm, Dashinsky, on June 12, 1919 gave the pogroms a humorous connotation: " 'Those who cut off a Jewish beard with childish joy (noisy laughter) and those who with infantile naivete declare that they will put an end to the speculators in one or two operations by killing several Jews—these people are children who cannot be taken seriously.' " *(Ib.)*

At the International Socialist Congress in Hamburg in 1923—"One speaker condemned the Polish Socialists because of their support of anti-Semitism and of the Fascisti in Poland." *(Jewish Exponent,* June 8, 1923). About two years later the Jewish Bund held a confer-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ence. The chief report dealt with the issue of anti-Semitism and the PPS. "Of particular interest is the point which throws light upon the attitude of the Polish Socialist Party (P.P.S.) towards the problem of anti-Semitism in Poland. It appears that the two labor parties, the PPS and the Bund, concluded an agreement some time ago to combat the anti-Semitic movement among the Polish working classes. This agreement brought no results because the Polish Socialist Party failed to do anything in this direction, the report states." *(J. D. B.* Jan. 5, 1925)

In the light of the long-established anti-Semitism of the PPS, the Bund, by concluding an agreement with that Party purportedly to combat anti-Semitism, was in reality fooling the workers. The leaders of the PPS refused to fight anti-Semitism because they themselves were anti-Semitic: "Polish Socialists Adopt Anti-Jewish Slogan in Election Campaign—The PPS, the Polish Socialist Party, which parades in the international arena as fighting for human rights, has displayed its chauvinist character in the present Warsaw municipal election campaign. Joining the cry of the Polish nationalist parties, the PPS adopted the election slogan 'Guard the purely Polish character of Poland's capital,' a slogan openly directed against the Jewish candidates." *(Ib.* May 8, 1927)

In 1928 Polish Social Democracy ruled that in the May Day celebration the Polish workers should hold a separate demonstration, and the Jewish workers should be segregated in a "ghetto" demonstration of their own: "These demonstrations, however, have to be divided into purely Polish and purely Jewish sections due to the unwillingness of the members of the Polish Socialist Party (PPS) to march with the members of the Jewish Socialist parties, Bund, Poale Zion and others." *(Ib.* April 22, 1928). The Jewish and Polish Marxist demonstrations were held close to each other with the result that the Jewish Marxist workers were attacked by the Polish. In 1929 the Jewish Marxist leaders kept their followers within the Ghetto: "Remembering the clashes which occurred during the May 1st demonstrations of 1928, resulting in many injuries, the Jewish labor parties of Poland have decided this year to observe May Day apart from the Polish labor parties. It was during the joint demonstration of the Jewish labor parties and the Polish Socialist Party last year that the demonstrations turned into a wholesale attack on Jews. This year the Jewish parties have decided to limit their May Day demonstrations to the Jewish quarter of Warsaw." *(Ib.* April 24, 1929). With all that the Bund was the chief agency of the Polish Socialist Party among the Jewish masses, tying them to the Polish bourgeoisie: "The General Jewish Workers' Union of Poland (Bund) which in a fraternal alliance with the Polish Socialist Party has always worked for the independence and glory of Poland." (Sikorski, Prime Minister of Poland (London Government) and commander-in-chief of the Polish forces, cited in *The Ghetto Speaks,* June 1, 1943)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The Jewish masses were not acquainted with the true record of the Bund; they did not know that it had capitulated on the issue of anti-Semitism to Lenin and Plekhanov in the 1905-7 pogrom period, that during the War of 1914 it split, one part supporting the anti-Semitic Tsar the other the anti-Semitic Kaiser, that after 1917, while one part of the Bund went over to the Kremlin burocrats who sold the Jews of the Ukraine to the pogromists, the "independent" section backed the pogromist Socialists of the Ukraine and Poland. Just before the Hitler invasion the overwhelming majority of the misguided Jewish masses of Poland was captured by the Bund: "The result of the recent municipal elections in Poland provided ample cause for rejoicing. Jewish labor's joy is twofold—on the one hand, it derives a measure of assurance from the victory of the Polish Socialist Party; on the other hand, it can be justly proud of the part played by the *Bund,* the Jewish section of the Socialist Party. The *Bund* achieved a genuine triumph; its victory exceeded all expectations. It obtained 85% of the entire Jewish vote in Poland." *(Workmen's Circle Call,* Jan. 1939, 4)

Thus, the Jewish masses of Poland were tied to the Bund, the Bund to the PPS, the PPS to the Polish bourgeoisie. The Polish bourgeoisie was but a pawn of the American and British imperialists. In the Spring of 1943 Stalin, Churchill and Roosevelt arranged a Conference in Bermuda to take up the question of refugees from Hitler's slaughter house, particularly the question of the Jews. "The *Manchester Guardian* expressed astonishment that even in the formal speeches at the opening session of the Conference the Jewish side of the Nazi persecution was completely ignored, though the Conference had 'sprung from the horrors of the Nazi extermination of the Jews.' The Foreign Editor of *PM,* Alexander Uhl, who attended the Conference—or rather, its lobbies—expressed the same opinion in the following words: 'It was regarded as almost improper to mention the word "Jew." ' " *(From Evian to Bermuda,* The Committee for a Jewish Army of Stateless and Palestinian Jews, 8)

In the latter part of October 1943, during the greatest mass extermination of Jews in history, Churchill, Roosevelt and Stalin met in Moscow. They issued a joint declaration on the crimes of the Nazis, omitting any reference to anti-Jewish bestialities and wholesale slaughter of the Jews. The Jewish workers everywhere were indignant. Thereupon the Bund covered up with "criticism" the anti-Jewish policy of Stalin and his "allies":

"Mention of Jews Omitted From the Declaration of the Moscow Conference. The tortured Jewish masses had the right to expect that, when the representatives of the United States, Soviet Russia, and Britain issued, in the name of the Conference, amongst their Statements, a Declaration concerning the crimes of Hitler's Reich, this document should give separate mention to the sufferings of the hardest-hit sector of Nazi Europe, the Jews. This grave error should be cor-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

rected with a supplementary Declaration by the participants in the Moscow Conference. American Representation of the General Jewish Workers Union ('Bund') of Poland." *(The Ghetto Speaks,* Dec. 1, 1943, 7)

Even the Jewish Liberals used a stronger language in criticizing the Kremlin Dictator and the Western imperialists:

"Moscow Pact Ignores the Jews. The unpardonable and in all likelihood deliberate omission is difficult indeed to account for. It is due apparently to the shameful policy long pursued by the United Nations of forgetting the Jew." *(Opinion,* Dec. 1943, 15)

Incidentally, at the Moscow Conference was the old Jewish Bolshevik diplomat, Litvinov. (F. L. Schuman, *Soviet Politics,* App.)

The Nazis, in executing their policy of keeping the mind of the German masses continuously turned against the Jews, met with a desperate attempt at resistance by the Jewish victims. This epic feature is recorded in history as the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto (April-May, 1943). But while physically the situation was, naturally, hopeless, the true tragedy of the situation, not only for the trapped but also for the rest of the Jews in the world, was written in the *politics* of the victims:

"From the highest building in the ghetto flew the flags of Poland, Great Britain and the Soviet Union." *(Contemp. Jewish Record,* August 1943. Cited by Feuer in *On Being a Jew,* 123). The most influential organization among the Jewish masses fighting under the anti-Semitic auspices was the Marxist Bund.

The Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto was the climax in the process of extermination of the Jewish Scapegoat in Europe. Not many weeks later Hitler virtually concluded the appalling mass murder of the Jews in his territories, and just then Stalin glorified the name of another infamous historical character whose butcheries of the Jews are known as the *"Chmielnicki massacres,* a series of outbreaks against the Jews in Ukraine, Volynia and Podolia, during the years 1648 and 1649, in which untold thousands of Jews were butchered (some estimates set the number as high as 300,000) by Cossacks under the hetman Bogdan Chmielnicki." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* III, 161)

One of the bloodiest of the Khmelnitsky carnages of the Jews occurred in Pereaslav. The Stalin burocracy now "honored" the city by naming it after Khmelnitsky: "In commemoration of the memory of the great son of the Ukrainian people, the wise statesman and military leader, the founder of the union of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples, Bogdan Khmelnitsky, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR decided that the city of Pereaslav, where Bogdan Khmelnitsky was born, and where the Pereaslav Rada was assembled, shall be called the city of Pereaslav-Khmelnitsky." *(Pravda,* Oct. 13, 1943)

Some innocent dupes of the Bolshevik burocracy might imagine that Khmelnitsky, despite being a pogromist, was a leader of the oppressed Ukrainian masses. The Stalin historians themselves had indicated Khmelnitsky's reactionary character: "Khmelnitsky was a rep-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

resentative of the Ukrainian-feudal-Cossack leaders who sought to secure equal rights with the Polish nobility . . . This explains the brutal suppression carried out by Khmelnitsky against the people's insurrection. Even more traitorous was Khmelnitsky's tactic with respect to the people's uprisings led by Nechay, Bogun and others. Khmelnitsky . . . gave direct aid to the Polish troops who were strangling the people's uprisings . . . Khmelnitsky savagely suppressed the peasant risings in the Ukraine. Dozens of cities and villages were completely destroyed and burned, tens of thousands of peasants and Cossacks, who fought against the Polish and Ukrainian feudal landlords, were quartered, impaled on stakes and otherwise executed . . . Khmelnitsky leaned upon the Ukrainian feudal landlord class, which by then had considerably grown, and sought to become an absolutist Tsar over the Ukraine." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LIX, 816, 817, 818). "Khmelnitsky manifested brilliant military and diplomatic abilities which he utilized in the betrayal of the Revolution." *(Lesser Sov. Enc.* IX, 576)

In fine, Khmelnitsky was a cruel Feudal dictator. Eventually he "took the oath of allegiance to the tsar (compact of Pereyaslavl, February 19, 1654); and all hope of an independent Cossack state was at an end." *(Enc. Br.* VI, 258)

Originally, as we see, Stalin's historians had presented a fairly correct picture of that sinister betrayer of the serfs, butcher of the Ukrainian masses and of the Jews. But during the "Great Fatherland War" against the Nazis Stalin's line was that of ingratiation with the extreme reactionary Ukrainian-nationalist elements, seeking to win their full allegiance to Moscow. Henceforth Khmelnitsky's figure has been repainted to suit this line. Thus, in the 1947 volume, "Union of Socialist Soviet Republics" (R), a supplement of the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia,* Khmelnitsky is done in "progressive" "revolutionary" colors: "1648. Beginning of the war of liberation under the leadership of Bogdan Khmelnitsky." ("Chronology" x)

Incidentally, on the matter of the history of the Ukraine and Khmelnitsky the Stalin historians in the text of the supplement reversed their line also on M. N. Pokrovsky, presenting him again in a favorable light!

And so, during the closing period of the Nazi butcheries in Poland and the Ukraine, Stalin was awarding a new "revolutionary" order, the Order of Bogdan Khmelnitsky, to the Red Army soldiers and officers, some of them probably descendants of the toiling Ukrainians and Jews upon whom Bogdan Khmelnitsky had committed unspeakable atrocities. Instructions were issued: "The Order of Bogdan Khmelnitsky is to be worn on the right side of the chest." *(Kalendar-Spravochnik,* 1944, 143). And the masses of the "Union of Socialist Soviet Republics" were informed that they respected Khmelnitsky's memory: "The Ukrainian people piously revere the name of Bogdan Khmelnitsky . . . it is loved by the Russian people,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

it is known and is pronounced with the greatest respect and love by all peoples of the Soviet Union." (166)

8. *The Stalin-Bourgeois Anti-Semitic Aftermath*

Two illusions were widely publicized by the Stalin and Social Democratic Marxists and the bourgeoisie during the terrifying years of the Nazi occupation of most of the European Continent: 1) the so-called United Nations, which included the Bolshevik State, would remove all Nazi officials from power: 2) the United Nations would uproot anti-Semitism. In 1945 Stalin and the Western imperialists occupied Germany, dividing the country into Russian, French, British and American Zones. On September 29, 1945 the White House released the Harrison Report on the condition of Jews in the American Zone: "As matters now stand, we appear to be treating the Jews as the Nazis treated them, except that we do not exterminate them."

In Austria, jointly occupied by Stalin and the Western imperialists, anti-Semitism was on the rampage: "At the University of Vienna, which had only twenty Jewish students last year, out of a total enrollment exceeding 8,000, the student body of the University engaged in open anti-Semitic activities; on one occasion they staged a 'welcome home party' for returning Nazi professors." *(Amer. J. Y. B.* 1946-7, 318). Stalin and the bourgeoisie integrated the old Nazi officials into the administrative machinery of Germany. The avowedly Marxist World Federation of Trade Unions sent one of its vice chairmen, a Jewish burocrat, to "investigate" the situation: "Hillman headed a W.F.T.U. commission that went to Germany in early 1946 to study labor conditions; the body reported on Feb. 27 that the occupation authorities of all four zones still maintained Nazis in responsible administrative positions." *(Brit. Book of the Year 1947,* 380)

In Poland Stalin established a puppet dictatorship under "President" Bierut. "The 86,000 survivors in Poland, out of a prewar population of 3,351,000 continued to live in great fear of sporadic outbreaks of anti-Semitism as was recently manifested in the pogrom in Kielce." *(American Annual,* 1947, 377). Polish Jews who had fled into Russia when the Nazis took over Poland were now sent back "home" by Stalin. What happened to the returning Jews in their old "fatherland" can be seen from an interview between Dr. Tenenbaum, President of the American and World Federations for Polish Jews, and Stalin's Polish President Bierut: " 'Mr. President,' I said, 'I come here as an American Jew, and my first concern is the terrible tragedy of my people. The Jewish people, the American people, want to know how it is possible that after the Nazi slaughter of six million Jews, there should be more pogroms, wholesale murders and open threats against the life of the pitiful remnants of Nazi bestiality. Day after day, Jews are being pulled out of trains, attacked in homes, smoked out of towns and villages, stripped naked and slain in streets

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and highways just as in the days of Nazism.'" (J. Tenenbaum, *In Search of a Lost People,* 226). *Jewish Life,* a Stalin publication in the United States, gave a very laudatory review of Tenenbaum's book (Sept. 1949) and made no denial of pogroms under Bierut.

CHAPTER XII.

MARXISM DIVERTS THE WORKERS FROM STUDYING ANTI-SEMITISM IN AMERICA

1. *Another Marxist Pretense*

DURING THE bloody havoc perpetrated by the Nazi regime, the Marxists, particularly in the United States, where they captured hundreds of thousands of Jewish workers and thousands of Jewish professionals and capitalists, made a pretense of attacking anti-Semitism. The Stalin and Social Democratic Marxists put out a number of pamphlets; the Trotskyites in their 1950 election platform adopted a slogan-phrase "Combat anti-Semitism in all its forms." *(Militant,* Oct. 2, 1950). But while on the surface the Marxists of all persuations and colors appeared to be dealing with the problem of anti-Semitism in America, in actuality they numbed the proletarian vanguard with respect to this vital problem. To show what Marxism in America has avoided exposing, we shall make a survey of anti-Semitism in the United States.

2. *Evolution of anti-Semitism in the United States*

American society at its very inception was nurtured on anti-Jewish spirit brought over from the Old World. Christianity was virtually the law of the land, and Christianity is full of contempt, hatred and castigation of the "crucifiers of our Lord." The widēst-read book was the Bible which presents Jesus as saying to the Jews "You are of your father, the devil." *(John,* VIII, 44). Jews were tolerated in the colonies but not welcomed. While the "English statesmen . . . looked with favor upon the German Lutherans who crowded into Pennsylvania . . ." they "winked at news of Jews settling here and there in the colonies . . ." (Charles and Mary Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization,* I, 30)

In Maryland the Jews were subject to legal terror by means of which the rulers imposed Christian mythology on the population as a whole. The Jews were denied citizenship in that State during the Washington Administration (1789-1799), and even during the Presidency of Thomas Jefferson (1801-1809) the author of the Declaration of Independence which proclaimed that all men were born free and equal. "All during the colonial period the life of Jews in Maryland was extremely hazardous. According to the Toleration Act of 1649,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

anyone not believing in the divinity of Christ could be punished with death. Even the revision of that Act in 1723 did not remove that punishment, but reserved it for the third offense. For the first offense the victim had his tongue bored through, and for the second he had the letter B burnt on his forehead. The well-known Jew, Jacob Lombrozo, managed to escape the extremety of those punishments, but was imprisoned for suggesting that Christ did not rise from the dead after his crucifixion. Even after the American Revolution Jews were still deprived of rights of citizenship. It was not until 1813 that they acquired those rights." (V. F. Calverton, *The Awakening America,* 239)

During the War of Independence (1775-1783) the Jews, as other colonists, were divided in their allegience. But when anyone on either side wanted to spread anti-Semitism that general fact was overlooked and the Jews were attacked as traitors: "In the *South Carolina and American General Gazette* of December 3, 1776, a writer who signed himself 'An American,' charged that he had met a large company *'of the Tribe of Israel*—who, after taking every advantage in trade the times admitted of in the State of Georgia, as soon as it was attacked by an enemy, fled here for an asylum, with their ill-got wealth—dastardly turning their backs upon the country when in danger, which gave them bread and protection.' " (P. S. Foner, *Jews in American History,* 26)

Notwithstanding the fact that there were very few Jews, the anti-Jewish spirit of American society was perpetuated through the importation and reprinting of Shakespeare, Marlowe, Gibbon and other literary contributors to the Defamation, sometimes with openly anti-Semitic introductory remarks. Native talent attempted to imitate the great European masters: "The first play by an American to portray a Jew, Mrs. Susanna Rawson's *Slaves in Algiers* (1794), presented him as a thorough scoundrel." (J. Mersand, *The American Drama Presents the Jew,* 7)

The most famous American diplomat, statesman and scientist of that period, Benjamin Franklin, made use of the Defamation in his correspondence:

". . . Keeping us out of Possession of 50,000 Pound Sterling's Worth of Goods for securing the Payment of a petty Demand for Damages, is not only ungenteel and dishonorable Treatment, but a monstrous Injustice. It seems to me that it is principally with Mr. Neufville we have to do; and tho' I believe him to be as much a Jew as any in Jerusalem, I did not expect that with so many and such constant Professions of Friendship for the United States with which he loads all his Letters, he would have attempted to inforce his Demands (which I doubt not will be extravagant enough) by a Proceeding so abominable." (Letter to John Adams, Nov 26, 1781. *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin,* Macmillan Co. VIII, 332). "By this time, I fancy, your Excellency is satisfy'd that I was wrong in sup-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

posing J. de Neufville as much a Jew as any in Jerusalem, since Jacob was not content with any percents, but took the whole of his Brother Esau's Birthright, and his Posterity did the same by the Cananites, and cut their Throats into the Bargain . . ." (Letter to John Adams, Dec. 14, 1781. *Ib.* 345)

Joseph Dennie, editor of *Farmer's Weekly Museum* and later personal secretary to Secretary of State Pickering, wrote to his parents on May 20, 1800: "But in this republic, this region, covered with the Jewish, and canting and cheating descendants of those men . . ." (Cited in *Pub. Am. J. Hist. Soc.*, Dec. 1948, 131)

The Left-most American bourgeois revolutionist, Thomas Paine, repeated an Ancient Defamation in making a distinction between the Chinese and the Jews: "The Chinese are a people who have all the appearance of far greater antiquity than the Jews, and in point of permanency, there is no comparison. They are also a people of mild manners and good morals, except where they have been corrupted by European commerce. Yet we take the word of a restless, bloody-minded people, as the Jews of Palestine were, when we would reject the same authority from a better people." *(Letter of Thomas Paine to Lawyer Erskine,* 13). Paine recited one of the customary anti-Jewish reproaches: "As to the Jews, there is not one single improvement in any scientific art, that they ever produced. They were the most ignorant of all the illiterate world." ("Sabbath, or Sunday" *The Age of Reason)*

The cry of "the Jewish press" was raised in the United States long before the days of Bakunin, Drumont and other Nineteenth Century Defamers. "An anti-Semitic issue was also injected into the election campaign in Pittsburgh, where the printer and publisher of the Jeffersonian paper, *Tree of Liberty,* was John Israel . . . When the *Tree of Liberty* appeared in the middle of August, 1800, a printed circular was issued with verses that spoke of 'the Jew Press' . . ." *(Pub. Am. J. Hist. Soc.,* Dec. 1948, 135-6)

In Gale's and Seaton's *Register of Debates in Congress,* Volume VIII, Part I, there is a record of Henry Clay's anti-Semitism. The personal object of his anti-Semitism was one Moses Meyers. A protest from the Jewish bourgeoisie followed. In a letter to Clay the President of the City Council of Baltimore, S. Etting, stated: "Baltimore, July 15, 1832. Dear Sir: You know that I am your friend, and therefore I write to you freely. Several of the religious society to which I belong, myself included, feel both surprised and hurt by the manner in which you introduce the expression 'the Jew' in debate in the Senate of the United States, evidently applying it as a reproachful designation of a man whom you considered obnoxious in character and conduct." *(P.A.J.H.S.* XVIII, 8)

We have seen that the American bourgeois press lent a hand to the Damascus Blood Accusation, and even the most Liberal newspaper, the *Tribune,* carried anti-Semitic articles ("The Russian Loan"

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

etc.). The virus spread by the Right and Left European Defamers made its mark on the most sincere American bourgeois writers and reformers. Thus, Ralph Waldo Emerson said in 1860 in his *Conduct of Life:* "The sufference, which is the badge of the Jew, has made him, in these days, the ruler of the rulers of the earth." The Abolitionist William Lloyd Garrison spoke of ". . . the murderous and oppressive Jews of old, who broke in pieces the people of God, and afflicted his heritage, who slew the widow, the stranger, and the fatherless—" ("Free Speech and Free Inquiry" *Selections,* 1852, 251)

Harriet Beacher Stowe, famous for her *Uncle Tom's Cabin,* wrote in the *Footsteps of the Master,* "the Jewish nation, for its sins and unfaithfulness, was suffered to go to wreck . . ." (44)

On the issue of Negro slavery the American Jewish bourgeoisie was divided, some supporting the Abolitionist viewpoint, others defending slavery. However, the Defamers in the North emphasized the latter feature:

"Not many people in the North knew that in 1849 Solomon Heydenfeldt of Alabama had published *A communication on the subject of slave immigration addressed to the Hon. Reuben Chapman, Governor of Alabama,* in which he attacked slavery and the slave trade. Nor did they know the story of how two Jewish brothers who lived in the South, Joseph and Isaac Friedman, befriended Negro slaves and assisted them in gaining their freedom. But they did know that a Jewish Southern leader, Judah P. Benjamin, of Louisiana, had declared in the United States Senate that the abolitionists were 'insane fanatics,' and that the Negroes were an 'inferior and servile race' who deserved to be held in bondage as 'mere property.' They knew, too, that Rabbi Morris J. Raphael of New York had delivered a sermon, entitled *Bible View of Slavery,* shortly after Lincoln's election, in which he justified Negro slavery on the ground that it existed 'through the providential allotment of the Divine Being,' and was in keeping with God's wishes as set forth in the Bible. The sermon was endorsed by Dr. Isaac M. Wise in the *American Israelite* and Isaac Lesser in the *Occident.* Moreover, it was published by a committee of pro-Southern merchants in New York City and widely circulated." (Foner, 60)

The division in the Jewish bourgeoisie gave rise to aspersions that the Jews *as a people* stood for Negro chattel bondage. Sometimes the most ridiculous and illogical reasoning was introduced to condemn all Jews. Greeley's Liberal paper wrote: "No people on earth have been more oppressed, robbed, trodden down, and persecuted, than the Jews; hence we naturally look to them to furnish apologists and pettifoggers for Slavery." *(N. Y. Tribune,* Jan. 7, 1861, 4)

Although in the next sentence the paper said it rejoiced in the knowledge that "only a part of them are thus perverted," the meaning of the citation is no other than that to find scoundrels who

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

employed mean and tricky ways of approving the bondage of the Negro, one *"naturally"* had to look among the *Jews!*

During the Civil War, Judah P. Benjamin entered the Confederate Cabinet as Attorney General, becoming soon the Confederate Secretary for War, and the anti-Semitic feeling in the North was intensified. "Every petty politician and every court poet defamed and slandered the Jews in the press and in Congress because that one Jew went with so many Christian colleagues over to the Confederacy. Senator Wilson (of Massachusets) and Johnson (of Tennessee) carried that slanderous language into the Senate of the United States." *(Israelite,* May 16, 1884. Cited by Kohler in *P.A.J.H.S.* XII, 85)

Generals in the Union Army expressed anti-Semitic feelings. The *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society* mentions "Gen. Benjamin F. Butler's censure of Jews in 1861." (XIV, 145). More serious was the position taken by General Grant: "On page 330 of *Series One,* Vol. XVII, Part II, of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies, we find a communication from Major General U. S. Grant to Major General Hurlburt, then stationed at Jackson, Tennessee. Writing at La Grange, Tennessee, on November 9, 1862, General Grant said: 'Refuse all permits to come south for the present. The Israelites especially should be kept out . . .' And again, on November 10, 1862, this time to General Webster at Jackson, Grant wrote: 'Give orders to all conductors on the road that no Jews are to be permitted to travel on the railroad from any point. They may go north and be encouraged in it; but they are such an intolerable nuisance that the department must be purged of them.' Writing—on December 17, 1862—from Headquarters of the Thirteenth Army Corps at Oxford, Mississippi, to the Assistant Secretary of War, C. P. Woolcott, General Grant said: 'I have long since believed that in spite of all the vigilance that can be infused into post commanders, the special regulations of the Treasury Department have been violated, and that mostly by Jews and other unprincipled traders. So well satisfied have I been of this that I instructed the commanding officer at Columbus to refuse all permits to Jews to come South, and I have frequently had them expelled from the department, but they come in with their carpetsacks in spite of all that can be done to prevent it. The Jews seem to be a privileged class that can travel anywhere.' " (Cited by W. E. Peck-Cincinnatus in, *War! War! War!,* 29-30)

"At the same time other Union generals were complaining of the Jews. 'To Maj. Gen. John A. Mc Clernand: The cotton speculators are quite clamorous for aid in getting their cotton away from Middleburg, Hickory Valley, etc. and offer to pay liberally for the service. I think I can bring it away with safety, and make it pay to the Government. As some of the Jew owners have as good as stolen the cotton from the planters, I have no conscientious scruples in making them pay liberally to take it away. L. F. Ross, Brigadier General.' " (31)

"Holly Springs, Miss. Dec. 8, 1862. On account of the scarcity of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

provisions all cotton speculators, Jews, and other vagrants having no honest means of support, except trading upon the misery of the country . . . will leave in twenty-four hours or will be put to duty in the intrenchments. By Order of Col. Jno. V. Du Bois, U. S. Army." (*American Israelite,* Dec. 26, 1862; *P.A.J.H.S.* XVII, 77)

On December 17, 1862 Grant issued an order: "The Jews, as a class violating every regulation of trade established by the Treasury Department and also department orders, are hereby expelled from the Department within twenty-four hours from the receipt of this order." (Cited by Heywood Broun and G. Britt in *Christians Only,* 35)

General Grant received support in the press. *Washington Chronicle* said: "The Jews have since the very unhandsome trick played by Jacob on his brother, been notorious for their fondness for illegitimate or, at least, unusual modes of making money."

The Jewish bourgeoisie raised a protest; "At a special meeting of the Executive Committee of the Board of Delegates of the American Israelites held in New York on January 8, 1863, the following resolutions were adopted: 'Resolved. That we have heard with surprise and indignation the intelligence that in the present century and in this land of freedom and equality, an officer of the United States should have promulgated an order worthy of despotic Europe in the dark ages of the World's history.' " (Quoted in *The Jewish Forum,* July 1943, 121)

The protest was sent to Lincoln who had Grant's order revoked. As many other public men of the bourgeoisie, Grant later realized that he had made a tactical error in revealing to the world his anti-Semitism. During his presidential campaign he modified his policy: "I have no prejudice against sect or race, but want each individual to be judged by his merit." (Broun and Britt, 37)

Following the Civil War the Jewish bourgeoisie as ever was kept formally on an equal plane with the Gentile, but in actuality was excluded from free exercise of "rights." For example *Harper's Magazine* for July 1877 recorded: "Recently in New York an estimable and accomplished gentleman was rejected as a member of the Bar Association 'for no reason that can be conceived,' indignantly said one of the leading members, 'except that he was a Jew.' "

In 1881 the official bourgeois press pretended excessive repugnance toward the Tsar but there was a section of the press "defending the Czarist pogroms." (Mentioned in *N. Y. T. Book Review* "The World of Emma Lazarus," 1949)

In the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century we find such eminent people as James Russell Lowell, poet and diplomat, picturing the Jews to be pickpockets: "Where would a Jew be among a society of primitive men without pockets, and therefore a *fortiori* without a hole in them." (*Letter to J. W. Field,* March 14, 1878, *Letters of James Russell Lowell,* 208)

The disturbed financial condition in the United States during

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Nineties was laid to the Jews—even in Left papers. The leader of the Knights of Labor observed: "In looking over reform papers I notice that the cause of our financial ills is charged to the Jews." (Terence V. Powderley in *Journal of Knights or Labor;* cited in *American Israelite,* Nov. 1893)

One of the Defamers who won considerable influence in the American Left bourgeois intellectual circles and among Socialist and other advanced workers was Mme. H. P. Blavatsky, who founded the Theosophical Society in New York in 1875. She proclaimed its principle: "universal brotherhood of humanity without distinction of race, color or creed." Meanwhile she expressed anti-Semitism both in private correspondence and in public press. Deeply imbued with Russian nationalism she defended the Tsar's Government against charges that it oppressed the Jews. She wrote to the New York *World:* "It is to be regretted that your incandescent contemporary, *The Sun,* should have no better source of information. It stated on Saturday last 'in Russia the persecution of the Israelites is continued, with nearly all its ancient cruelty. They are not permitted to reside in many of the greatest cities. Kiev and Novgorod, as well as Moscow, are forbidden to them, and even in the rural districts they are burdened with multiform exactions.' This is the reverse of correct . . . If social disabilities still linger, we are scarcely the ones to chide, in view of our Saratoga and Long Branch custom, and the recent little unpleasantness between Mr. Hilton and the descendants of the 'chosen people.'" *(N. Y. World,* Sep. 25, 1877; *Comp. Works,* I, 157-8)

Blavatsky was a great student, was very well informed regarding Russian affairs. What she hypocritically circumvented was the fact that the Jewish *masses* were forbidden *by law* to reside outside the pale of settlement established in 1791. The right to leave the pale was granted to some categories of Jewish merchants and to certain other "privileged" Jewish elements. As to Defamation, be it recalled that only about a year earlier Lutostansky, endorsed by crown prince, future Alexander III, published the most powerful literary Blood Accusation attack on the Jews in the history of Russia.

Blavatsky's aversion and contempt for the Jews would break out in various ways: "What is also needed is to impress men with the idea that, if the root of mankind is one, then there must also be one truth which finds expression in all the various religions—except in the Jewish, as you do not find it *expressed* even in the Kabalah." *(Key to Theosophy,* 41). "The cruel, anthropomorphic, and jealous God of the Jews . . ." (73). "If Jesus ever lived there's 99 to 100 to bet that he was an unwashed Jew and no 'gentleman' in his manners." (Letter to Sinnet, Aug. 26, 1882. *The Letters of H. P. Blavatsky,* 33). "Our journal is not connected with, and carefully avoids everything of a political character. Therefore such vilifications as contained in the said article, namely, a low and vulgar abuse of Russia, its 'barbarian moujik' and the 'worthy countrywoman of Ignatieff' and especially the mention of

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the 'red cock' crowing over the Jew's house'—cannot find room in its columns. But such matter would be received, most likely, with cheerful welcome in those of a third-class Jewish, Russophobic organ in Germany." (III, 288-9)

Mark Twain in a pamphlet *Concerning the Jews* (1898) under the guise of seeking a "friendly" solution of the endless persecution of the Scapegoat, wrote: "I am convinced that the persecution of the Jew is not due in any large degree to religious prejudice. No, the Jew is a moneygetter; and in getting his money he is a very serious obstruction to less capable neighbors who are on the same quest. I think that is the trouble. In estimating world values the Jew is not shallow, but deep. With precocious wisdom he found out in the morning of time that some men worship rank, some worship heroes, some worship power, some worship God, and that over these ideals they dispute and cannot unite—but that they all worship money; so he made it the end and aim of his life to get it." (16)

In 1900 Robert Louis Stevenson's impressions of an American tour were published in the United States. The novelist prophesied that the Jewish bourgeoisie might enslave the American farmers: "American farmers in many parts of the State expect unlimited credit, and profit by it in the meanwhile, without a thought for consequences. Jew storekeepers have already learned the advantage to be gained from this, they lead on the farmer into irretrievable indebtedness, and keep him ever after as their bond-slave hopelessly grinding in the mill. So the whirligig of time brings in its revenges, and except that the Jew knows better than to foreclose, you may see Americans bound in the same chains with which they themselves had formerly bound the Mexican." ("The Old Pacific Capital," *Across the Plains,* 100-101)

Although the Jews in the United States had begun to receive rights before the issue was brought up in France, England and other capitalist countries, they were established only theoretically on an equal plane. The ruling Gentile bourgeoisie established restrictive covenants to keep the Jews out of certain residential areas, business sectors and educational institutions. Under this pressure of undesirability the "assimilatory" and "melting pot" delusion among the Jews gave way to the old clannish psychology. The result was the growth of something of a ghetto. The naive Liberals painted this Ancient custom of segregation of the Jews as the tortuous path to Jewish *emancipation!* "The emancipation of the Jews has not taken place without internal struggle and external conflict. Jewry itself has been swept repeatedly by cross-currents of sentiment. When the forward, outward movement of the race has been too rapid, it has invariably provoked a racial reaction in the outer gentile world, and Jewish life has been thrown back upon itself. What, then, happens is that the Jewish community contracts and withdraws into itself.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Shadows of the old ghetto walls arise." (R. E. Park, "Behind Our Masks," *Survey Graphic,* May, 1926, 136)

The anti-Jewish spirit of the ruling Gentile bourgeoisie has been communicated to the Gentile proletariat. The "Jew-consciousness" of the Gentile American backward masses has expressed itself not only in false "Aryan" pride, scurrilous remarks, anti-Semitic humor and the avoidance of associating with the Jewish workers socially but sometimes even in objections to *working with them in the same shop!* An example: "Fifteen hundred workmen in a shoe factory at Spencer, Mass., threaten a strike unless nine Jews employed there are dismissed." *(A.J.Y.B.* 1906-7, 235)

The anti-Jewish spirit of American society finds occasional reflection in Congress in various forms including the "Rothschild" part of the Defamation: "The late sessions of Congress have been occupied with monetary affairs and ever and anon some opprobrious reference was made to the Jew Rothschild. In treating of the silver question one advocate said: 'Burn up and destroy the nation if necessary, but no more gold bonds to Rothschilds' " *(Am. Is.,* April 4, 1895)

The "Rothschild" feature of the Defamation in the United States was carried over by the learned element into the Twentieth Century. In 1913 "Prof. David Starr Jordan, ex-president of Leland Stanford University, spoke of 'an invisible empire founded by the pawnbroker Rothschild.' " *(Enc. of Jewish Knowledge,* 41)

Reflecting the tradition of the European bourgeoisie, the American Christian capitalist class did not treat the Jews as a compactly unified national group but drew a line between the Ashkinasim Jews arriving from Eastern Europe and the Sephardim from the West European countries. "The Sephardic Jews have been an asset to the community since colonial days, and never had to complain of any popular prejudice against them until the recent mass-immigration of Ashkenazim aroused a strong anti-Jewish feeling which most unjustly failed to discriminate between different sorts of Jews." (L. Stoddard, *Re-Forging America,* 230-1). By implication, the Jews from Poland, Russia and Rumania were a bad sort of Jews. In this classification the Gentile bourgeoisie was supported by the condition within the Jewish population itself. "In passing, we may remark that the Sephardic and German Jewish groups have no liking for their Eastern co-religionists, so there has been little intermarriage and the stocks remain distinct." (131)

Since the days of Grant, Government Defamation made its appearance more than once. During the World War, Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War in Wilson's Cabinet, officially stated on February 14, 1918: "Causes and motives of malingering: These must be clearly understood in order that medical examiners may be on the alert for deception. The foreign born, and especially Jews, are more apt to malinger than the native born."

When Lenin established the Russian Marxist State, some United

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

States Government officials joined in the world-wide Defamation campaign which stamped the Bolshevik Revolution as Jewish. The U. S. Ambassador to Russia during the Bolshevik Revolution saw it necessary to say that the Jews were a majority of the Bolshevik leadership: "The Bolshevik leaders here, most of whom are Jews . . ." (D. R. Francis, *Russia From the American Embassy,* 214). "In 1919 a Senate committee heard charges that East Side Jews caused the Bolshevik Revolution." *(A.J.Y.B.,* 1948-49, 77). The Report of the Joint Legislative Committee of the State of New York Investigating Seditious Activities (1920) known as the Lusk Report, stated: "Hungarian and Soviet Governments principally Jewish."

The American bourgeois press beguiled its readers with the anti-Semitic interpretation of Bolshevism. Shortly before the October Revolution an American capitalist paper stated: "Jews now control Russia." *(Globe,* Oct. 2, 1917). After October this charge became commonplace: "Russia is ruled by 384 men. Of this number only 13 are real Russians; 300 of the remainder are Hebrews." *(Manufacturers' Record of Baltimore,* June 2, 1919). "In all Bolshevik institutions, the heads are Jews." *(Asia,* Feb-March 1920). "Trotsky Leads Jew-Radicals to World Rule." *(Chicago Tribune,* June 19, 1920). "The Jewish phase of the movement, he asserts, aims at a new racial domination of the world . . ." *(Ib.* June 21, 1920). In the same period of 1920 *The Christian Science Monitor,* highly touted as an extremely objective Liberal bourgeois publication, said editorially: "It would be a tremendous mistake to conclude that the Jewish peril, given another name and atmosphere, does not exist." The theme identifying Jews as Bolsheviks and Bolsheviks as Jews continued for many years. "The Communists are Jews, and Russia is being entirely administered by them." (Clare Sheridan, *N. Y. World,* Dec. 15, 1923)

United States Senators reportedly gave credence to the exposed and discredited *Protocols of Zion:* "About a year ago a representative of the Department of Justice submitted to me a copy of the manuscript of 'The Jewish Peril' by Professor Nilus, and asked for my opinion of the work . . . He said that some American Senators who had seen the manuscript were amazed to find that so many years ago a scheme had been elaborated by the Jews which is now being carried out, and that Bolshevism had been planned years ago by Jews who sought to destroy the world." (Herman Bernstein, *American Hebrew,* June 25, 1920)

On the other hand, some Jewish Liberals in utter ignorance and stupidity put in a claim for credit in the creation of the Russian-nationalist Marxist dictatorship: "What Jewish idealism and Jewish discontent have so powerfully contributed to accomplish in Russia, the same historic qualities of the Jewish mind and heart are tending to promote in other countries." *(American Hebrew and Jewish Messenger,* Sept. 10, 1920; *American Hebrews,* CVII, 507)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In America, as elsewhere, Jewish bourgeois "idealism" and "mind and heart" were grist to the mills of anti-Semitism.

3. *Ominous Signs in Latin America*

Prior to the world-wide anti-Semitic agitation of the Nazis, Defamation in Latin America was not very pronounced. In the Thirties the Hitler propaganda, laying the crises in Capitalism to the Jews, found an echo in many Latin American countries, even in Liberal Mexico: "The first note of hostility toward Jews was struck by merchants of Mexico City in 1931-1932 when the impact of the depression was felt with full force." (Leo Schwartz, *Where Hope Lies,* 75). The feverish activity of the professional Defamers in Mexico began to show itself in the measures adopted by organized Gentile capitalists and their official institutions. "A new anti-Semitic drive is reported in the Mexican State of Sonora. The local Chamber of Commerce has pledged its members to boycott Jewish business. Special taxes were levied by the state government upon Jewish shopkeepers. The taxes imposed on the Jews are four times as high as those imposed on non-Jews." *(Congress Bulletin,* June 7, 1935). "Anti-Jewish Tide in Mexico Rises. Mexico City—A bill aimed chiefly against Jews and proposing to exclude all foreigners from the country's small business enterprises, was introduced into Congress here, and was followed by a demand from the National Revolutionary bloc of the Senate, supporters of President Lazaro Cardenas, that the Department of Interior should send Congress a list of Jews in Mexico, a report of their status under Mexican law and an estimate of capital they have in Mexico. There are about 18,000 Jews in Mexico." *(American Hebrew,* Nov. 12, 1937)

But as we have indicated, the anti-Semitic tide was not limited to Mexico: "A wave of anti-Semitism has spread throughout South America. Bolivia has been hermetically sealed since May, 1940. Even Jewish visitors are not admitted . . . The Peruvian law prohibiting peddling has affected the Jews. It is even difficult for a Peruvian Jew to obtain a license for business. Brazil has outlawed the Zionist movement. And it is practically impossible for a Jew to become an interne in an Argentine hospital . . ." *(Workmen's Circle,* Oct. 1941). In January 1943 reports came of minor pogroms in several cities in South America. *(Zaria,* N. Y., Jan. 15, 1943, 9). In Argentina "In May and June there were additional manifestations of anti-Semitism in the province. 250 Jewish teachers in the public schools were dismissed; physical assaults upon Jews occurred more frequently, and Jewish shops were vandalized. Towards the end of May, 1944, the streets of Buenos Aires were strewn with pamphlets urging violence against the Jews." *(Am. J. Y. B.,* 1944-5, 294-5). "Columbia, though a country of democratic traditions, was the scene of anti-Semitic demonstrations, provoked by students . . . The building of the *Centro Israelita* was

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

stoned amid shouts of 'Death to the Jews'" *(Ib.* 1946-7, 250). "In Costa Rica, just as in the other countries of Central America, the small Jewish community is encountering a wave of anti-Semitism." (252)

4. *Organized Anti-Semitism in the United States*

Defamation in the United States assumed an organized form long before the Nazis rose to State power. "The circulation of the protocols in the United States coincides with a wave of feeling against the recent immigrant stocks in which for the first time anti-Semitism came to the surface as a public phenomenon . . . Even before the war anti-Semitism existed as a basic social-psychological sentiment. This sentiment found its expression in the exclusion of Jews from fashionable hotels and summer resorts and in discrimination against Jews as employees in the business world. Along with these manifestations may also be mentioned a certain discrimination against Jews as students and faculty members in the colleges and universities. But it was not until the period of 1917-1925 that people began to talk openly of anti-Semitism. It was in this period that the agitation against the 'International Jew' was carried on by the *Dearborn Independent,* owned by Henry Ford . . ." *(Enc. of Social Sciences,* II, 124)

May 1920 is a memorable date in the evolution of the Defamation on American soil. Henry Ford, the automobile magnate, launched in his paper *The Dearborn Independent* an extremely virulent attack against the "International Jew." In magnitude and malignity the campaign rivaled those of the Black Hundreds and the Nazis. Norman Hapgood, American newspaperman, Minister to Denmark, stated: "In the atmosphere in which Ford's detectives worked, there was talk of actual pogroms to come to this country." (Cited by M. Sayers and E. Kahn in *The Great Conspiracy Against Russia,* 50)

Backed by a billion-dollar power, Ford's agents established connections with organized anti-Semitism abroad. In 1923, Auer, Vice President of the Bavarian Diet, revealed: "The Bavarian Diet has long had information that the Hitler movement was partly financed by an American anti-Semitic chief, Henry Ford." *(N.Y.T.,* Feb. 8, 1923)

For seven years Ford raged on, blaming the Jews for every catastrophe caused by world Capitalism and Marxism. The masses everywhere feared and hated war most, so Ford offered them a means for preventing international armed conflict: "Corral fifty wealthiest Jews and there will be no more war." In Ford's propaganda the Gentile capitalists were not really capitalists: "The true capitalists of the world are Jews, who are capitalists for capital's sake. It is hard to believe that they wish to destroy capital; they wish to obtain sole control of it, and their wish has long been in fair way of fulfillment." *(The Jewish Question,* selection of Articles (1920-22) from Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent,* 46-7)

At length Ford evidently realized that it was a mistake to reveal

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to the masses that a powerful industrial king was behind the anti-Semitic drive. The German industrialists and financiers avoided such a stupid error and so had the Tsar. Ford "retracted" the vituperative accusations against the Jews. But while his long and loud anti-Semitic campaign had been given prominence against a background of anti-Semitic passions in Europe, his quiet "retraction," was buried by the bourgeois press. "Any newspaperman knows that a denial seldom has the same force as the original statement, and Mr. Henry Ford was not able to correct by his recantation the damage which he had done in furthering anti-Jewish prejudice." (Broun, Britt, 16)

The rest of the Defamers were not in the least dismayed by Ford's "reformation." Their explanation was that his moral backbone had been broken by the Jew power. The Defamation propaganda about the "Jewish power" was given "authentication" by the Jewish bourgeoisie itself. Ford, supposedly, got frightened because one of the Jewish bourgeois leaders threatened legal action against him: "Not until 1927, on threat of a suit for libel, did Ford publicly confess his error . . ." (O. I. Janowsky, *The American Jew,* 190). Ford, of course, was not scared by any "Jewish threats." He simply recognized the fact that the backing of anti-Semitism by industrial and financial kings must be concealed from the masses. It was the height of irony for one of the wealthiest capitalists in the world to pretend that he was no real capitalist but that the Jews were.

That Ford's recantation was a stratagem for retiring behind the scenes became obvious some years afterward. In July 1938 "Adolph Hitler awarded to Henry Ford the Grand Cross of the German Eagle, the highest decoration Germany can bestow on a foreigner." (U. P. dispatch, Washington, July 30, 1938). And now Ford was put in a position where he had to show his true face. *He accepted Hitler's decoration!* The Jewish bourgeoisie voiced its disapproval. One of its organizations thus addressed the hypocritical billionaire Defamer: "The Jewish War Veterans of the United States observe with shocked regret newspaper reports of your acceptance of the award of the Grand Cross of the German Eagle at the hands of the Hitler regime . . . In the name of humanity and Americanism we call upon you to repudiate that award and all it stands for." (Cited in *Jewish Life,* Sept. 1938). Ford disregarded the plea, and the Jewish bourgeoisie quietly dropped the matter.

Ford's sensational campaign, though of a comparatively limited duration, dealt with all the cultural, social and economic processes. The English language was declared to be the spiritual legacy of the Anglo-Saxons; the Jews were charged with polluting it with "Yiddish." They were accused of exercising debilitating and harmful influence over the Gentile children:

"Parents ignorant of the force of mental suggestion upon personal character may say, 'Oh, let the children amuse themselves.' But when the children, who have been reared on a mental diet of Sunday

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

'comics' and Jewish movies, grow up into worthless, unmanageable characters, whose interests seem to be limited to cigarettes and sex, parents wonder why." ("Judaism in the Comics" *The American Standard,* April 15, 1924, 7)

The economic crisis during Hoover's presidency as well as Roosevelt's New Deal were pictured by the active Defamers as Jewish machinations. "Much more serious, however, was the deliberate and organized attempt to use the Jew as a scapegoat for economic distress and political tension. The depression was attributed to 'Jewish bankers' and the New Deal to 'Jewish radicals.' Numerous anti-Semitic organizations made their appearance. Some of them, it is true, were led by self-seeking cranks. Others, however, had the support of men of means and influence." (O. I. Janowsky, ed. *The American Jew,* 193)

The charge that the Government of the United States was passing, or actually had passed, into Jewish hands was given impetus with the "discovery" that the Roosevelt family might have been of Jewish ancestry. "Now Franklin D. Roosevelt has never disclaimed his Jewish ancestry. In a letter to the *Detroit Jewish Chronicle,* March 13, 1936 he said: 'In the distant past, my ancestors may have been Jews. All I know about the origin of the Roosevelt family is, that they are descended from Claes Martenszen van Rosenvelt, who came from Holland.' He conceded thereby that his name should be spelled with an 'n' " *(Liberation,* Oct. 28, 1938, 7)

The familiar "Rothschild" pattern was introduced in an effort to prove that the basic American industry was owned by the Jewish bourgeoisie: "Through the Rothschild international banking firms of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. and J. P. Morgan & Co., the Rothschild interests own the railroads, U. S. Steel Corporation, Bethlehem Steel, and probably the other major steel companies and other monopolies." (Armstrong, *The Corruption of America,* 33). "Jewish monopolies are crushing the small independent American business man out of existence." *(American Bulletin* #8, May 15, 1935). "The Jew is the source of all our troubles." *(Ib.)*

One way to create the impression that the Jewish bourgeoisie controlled the United States economy was to multiply the number of Jews: "New statistics, however, indicate there are over 12,000,000 Jews in the United States *where they control more than sixty per cent of the vital interests of our country." (Hidden Empire,* Pelley Publishers, 25)

On the one hand, the Defamers admitted that—"The exploitation of the workers in the capitalistic system cannot be denied. In this system the surplus value of production is not distributed according to the principle of personal ability and value but according the strong arm law." *(American Bulletin,* Dec. 17, 1935). On the other hand the Defamers entangled themselves in a contradiction; they described Capitalism as *Jewish* and at the same time presented the much discussed idea of revolution against Capitalism as a Jewish

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

plot "the true purpose of which is only to break down the law of the Goyim States and to place the property of the Goyim into the hands of the Jews." *(Ib.)*

Whether the Defamers pretended to dislike Capitalism or not, the idea that Capitalism was originated by Jews constituted a basic point in modern anti-Semitic propaganda. As Mrs. Nesta Webster, an erudite, leading Defamer wrote: "At any rate, whether we regard the 'Capitalist system' as an evil or not, we cannot deny that the Jews were mainly responsible for it." *(World Revolution,* 95.) Searching for the root of this brand of political demagogy we trace it to Left anti-Semites, and in a more developed form, to Marx. The Marxists inconspicuously inserted this feature of Defamation in their literature. Mehring gave the Marxist view that Christian society was *practical Judaism:* "Practical Judaism is nothing but the fully-developed Christian world. As bourgeois society is of a completely commercial Jewish character . . ." *(Karl Marx,* 101)

With far greater logic one could say that bourgeois society was *English* in character, since Capitalism proper had its beginning in England, but such a view too would hardly be scientific.

5. *The "Christian Country" Slogan of Active Anti-Semitism in the United States*

The establishment of the United States dates to the adoption of the Declaration of Independence by the Continental Congress in Philadelphia on July 4, 1776. Though religious in tone the Declaration of Independence did not claim to speak for a body of Christian believers nor did it claim that the new State was to be founded on Christianity. Similarly, the Constitution of the United States, adopted on September 17, 1787, did not proclaim the United States to be a Christian country, while the President's oath excluded reference to any religion whatsoever. (Article II, Sect. 1, #8). In 1796 the United States concluded a treaty with Tripoli. Article XI of the Treaty plainly stated that the United States "is not in any sense founded on the Christian religion." (Cited by Carey McWilliams in *A Mask for Privilege: Anti-Semitism in America,* 51). Thus officially the United States was not part of the declared Christendom, although factually it was. And though the population was Christian and the Defamation and local disfranchisement were present, the handful of Jews did not feel the official Christian State pressure of isolation which was so strongly emphasised by the Christian States of Europe.

However, the public figures and Government officials early began to inject a different note into their statements and declarations. In 1834 it was stated in a court in Maryland that: "Ours is a Christian community, and a day set apart as the day of rest, is the day consecrated by the resurrection of our Saviour . . ." (Cited by A. Friedenberg, in *New Era,* Aug. 1905, 171). Governor J. H. Hammond of S. Carolina

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in his Thanksgiving Proclamation inserted the words: "Jesus Christ, the redeemer of the world . . ." (Cited in *Documentary History of the Jews in the U. S.,* Morris U. Schappes ed. 237). Hammond reacted defiantly and rudely to the protests of the Jewish bourgeoisie. In 1848 Governor W. F. Johnston of Pennsylvania injected the "Christian country" phraseology into an official proclamation. Some of the comments of the Jewish press read: "It is surprising that, even in the United States of America, spite their boasted liberality, there exist yet some remnants of religious intolerance, savouring of notions of a 'Christian State.' It appears from the *Occident* that a Day of Thanksgiving was appointed by the Governor of Pennsylvania, on the 23 November last, in commemoration of the successful termination of the Mexican War . . . The words 'by all denominations of Christians' and the allusion to the 'Redeemer,' had of course an exclusive effect regards the Jews . . ." *(Jewish Chronicle,* London, Jan. 12, 1849)

"Carl Sandburg, in *The War Years* (Vol. I, p. 39), notes that when Lincoln, in an impromptu speech at Lafayette, Ind. remarked to his audience that 'still we are bound together in Christianity, civilization and patriotism,' Jewish citizens protested, wishing to know when the United States was exclusively bound to Christianity as against other religions. The *Israelite,* conceding the possibility that Lincoln used the term loosely to signify religion, took occasion to remark that he had not yet learned the precise use of words. When Lincoln used similar phrasing in his first inaugural address and again in his Grand Order Respecting the Observation of the Sabbath Day in the Army and Navy (November 15, 1862), several Jewish citizens protested." *(Un. J. Enc.* VII, 66)

In the 1880's Governor Hoyt of Pennsylvania used the expression "Christian Commonwealth" in his Thanksgiving proclamation. After a protest from the Jewish bourgeoisie he withdrew the word "Christian." *(American Jewish Hist. Soc.* XX)

The opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of the Church of the Holy Trinity versus the United States (143 U. S. 437) declared that the United States is a Christian nation. (Feb. 29, 1892 per Justice Brewer)

Theodore Roosevelt's Progressive Party (June 1912) adopted the hymn "Onward Christian Soldiers." A portion of the American Jewish bourgeoisie, led by Oscar S. Strauss, supported Roosevelt and these "Progressives" were made a little uncomfortable by the song. The *American Israelite* registered a mild opposition to its being played in Jewish neighborhoods: "With Hon. Oscar S. Strauss as the nominee for the governorship of New York on the Progressive ticket, this question rises: Will the voters on the East Side of New York march to the Progressive battle hymn, 'Onward, Christian Soldiers,' or will the song have to be changed to fit the candidate?"

In 1914 in a speech before the American University at Washington, President Wilson made an extremely bigoted assertion: "Scholar-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ship has never been, so far as I can at this moment recall, associated with any religion except the religion of Jesus Christ." There were the usual protests from the Jewish bourgeoisie.

The Federal Reserve Bank and Liberty Loan Committee advertised for a "Stenographer for the Liberty Loan Committee (Christian)." Protests were made to Benjamin Strong, chairman of the Committee, and to Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo.

In the Army "the manual used in training officers at Plattsburg defined the 'ideal officer' as a 'Christian gentleman.'" (Carey McWilliams, 126)

Alfred E. Smith, one time governor of New York State and Democratic Party Candidate for President, in his Hippodrom speech on April 13, 1937 called the United States "a Christian country." The Jewish bourgeoisie voiced a protest.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared on September 21, 1940: "If the Spirit of God is not in us, and if we will not prepare to give all that we have and all that we are to preserve Christian civilization in our land, we shall go to destruction." *(Public Papers,* IX, 372; *The Bible and the Nations)*

Henry A. Wallace, former Vice-President and the 1948 Candidate for President of the Progressive Party, which he founded, supported by the Stalin Marxists, habitually stocked his speeches with Biblical quotations and references to Christianity. In October 1949 he stated: "How many times I have said that post-war America will be headed straight for World War III until such time as the Christian conscience of America is aroused." *(Sunday Compass,* Oct. 30, 1949)

A well-known bourgeois journalist and radio-commentator, H. R. Knickerbocker, broadcast a talk "Jesus Christ and Karl Marx" over the Mutual Network on Christmas night 1948. After his death it was rebroadcast on Christmas night 1949. In this talk he very emphatically declared: "This *is* a Christian nation," "We *are* a Christian nation," "The United States is strong because Americans are free, and Americans are free because Jesus Christ leads them."

Discussing the terrible destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb, Professor S. K. Alleson of the University of Chicago, said: "After all, we are a Christian nation with a sense of morality." *(N. Y. T.,* Feb. 5, 1950)

In a message to Pope Pius XII dated August 28, 1947 President Truman declared: "Your Holiness, this is a Christian Nation. More than a half century ago, that declaration was written into the decrees of the highest court in this land. As a Christian nation our earnest desire is to work with men of good-will everywhere." There was considerable resentment on the part of the Jewish bourgeoisie. *(Jewish Forum,* July 1948; *Ib.* Oct. 1948)

We observe that since the days of Washington, the leading public figures of the Gentile bourgeoisie have made great strides in reversing the original non-Christian official position of the United States. And

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

yet during Washington's presidency there were hardly three thousand Jews in the country, whereas at the time of the Truman message there were almost 5,000,000! Moreover, the population in Washington's time was more strongly imbued with Christian doctrine. From this aspect alone the designation "Christian country" could have been more logically applied to the United States under Washington than under Truman. But Washington's public language was different from Truman's. Carey McWilliams draws attention to this fact: " 'The government of the United States,' wrote George Washington, 'is in no sense founded on the Christian religion. The United States is not a Christian nation any more than it is a Jewish or a Mohammedan nation.' " (51)

The oft-voiced resentment of the Jewish bourgeoisie in the United States against the designation "This is a Christian nation" represents a feeling of alarm. However, the idealogists of the Jewish bourgeoisie only vaguely sense the danger implied in this designation. They do not expressly state that the designation not only widens the gulf between the Christian population and the Jews but it definitely turns the mind *against* all those who are clearly not of the Christian community, particularly against the Jews. The burning of Jews in the fires of the Inquisition, the extermination of the Jews with the swords of the Crusaders, the lances of Khmelnitsky's Cossaks, the guns of the pogromists in Tsarist Russia and Petlura's Ukraine and in Hitler's gas chambers represented the culmination of Christian incitement against the Jews. The designation "This is a Christian country" is cut from the same cloth and therefore has been adopted as the central slogan by the open anti-Semites in the United States. An organization is formed, The Christian Front. A demand for the expulsion of the Jews is raised: "This is a Christian country. Who isn't a Christian—throw him out." "Send Jews back where they came from—in leaky boats." (Cited by Norman Thomas, in *What's Behind the Christian Front,* 7). In 1935 William Dudley Pelley, a professional Defamer, issued "a leaflet bearing his face and the slogan in 36 point type: 'At the Sign of the Cross.' Turning a phrase from Marx, our Aryan hero concluded his appeal to the American people with: 'Christians Unite! You Have Nothing to lose But Your Jewish Shackles!' " *(American Hebrew and Jewish Tribune,* Sept. 13, 1935, 279)

Imbued with the spirit of a missionary duty and basing itself on the thesis *This is a Christian country* the open anti-Semitic movement has ranged over the United States. Organizations sprang up with names such as Christian Crusaders, Galileans, Committee for Christ's Cause in America, Christian Mobilizers and a host of others with similar Christian titles. A pseudo-radical group calling itself Christian-Democrats appeared in Texas: "Christian Democrats—the Christocrats—will exercise their concerted energies and intelligence to eradicate the Jewish-Rothschild-Talmudic system of money and banking

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

from the United States." (Christian Democratic Corporation, Dallas, Texas, 1937, *Christocracy,* 34)

Although their platform is buttressed on monstrous lies, the declared anti-Semites stand on truth when they assert that the United States is a Christian country. This is a fact beyond all question, despite all the protests of the Jewish bourgeoisie and George Washington's official attitude. No better sign exists than the growing official observance of Christmas as the major Christian holiday. It is a legal holiday in New York City where 30% of the population consists of Jews.

In the past the American Jewish bourgeoisie stood aloof from the Christmas celebration and even criticised the Christians for observing it: "From an historical standpoint, Christmas is not only not justified, but should be condemned as a Christian holiday." (M. P. Jacobson, *Am. Israelite,* Jan. 7, 1892). But this attitude has been abandoned. A growing section of the American Jewish bourgeoisie has adopted a Marrano attitude toward this Christian holiday and has been celebrating Christmas more and more regularly with each passing year. "Is Christmas a Jewish holiday? Emphatically no! But Jews seem to include it in their festival cycle. Numberless Jews advertise Christmas holiday greetings in the daily press. Jews present gifts to their Jewish friends, and with characteristic ostentation participate in so-called 'community' Christmas tree celebrations. Jews are the first to proclaim Christmas as a 'national' holiday, thus seeking to justify their own participation." (L. I. Newman, *Anglo-Saxon and Jew,* 16-17)

In the observance of Christmas the American Jewish bourgeoisie simply followed in the footsteps of its British counterpart: "In Jewry Christmas is Kept. Not a Religious Festival But A National Holiday. A great Silent Revolution has been working in the Habits of the Chosen People, and they will Feast on Friday. A decade ago, or there abouts, the celebration of Christmastide was a thing in which the East End Jew took no part. It was a season which had no particular significance for him, and the festivities which marked its advent on every side were matters which did not interest him any more than they created within his soul a desire to participate in them. But 'Father Time,' in conjunction with 'Uncle Mannie,' has changed all this." *(Jewish Chronicle,* Dec. 25, 1896)

Not that the British or the American Jewish bourgeoisie is embracing Christianity. The act of Jewish observance of Christmas has been rather an instinctive attempt to demonstrate good will toward the ruling Christian bourgeoisie, a tacit acknowledgement that the United States just as Britain is a Christian country. It is the expression of a desire to avoid giving offense to the Christians, factually an act of voluntary capitulation to anti-Semitism, something to which the Jewish Scapegoat has not stooped even in the blackest periods of persecution by the Medieval Church.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

6. *Dictionaries, Encyclopedias and Anthologies As Vehicles of Defamation*

The protagonist in Moliere's play *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* discovers to his amazement that all his life he had been speaking prose and was never aware of this fact. So it is that in the United States, as in other Christian countries, people mechanically repeat Defamation terms in their everyday speech. Contemptuous anti-Jewish remarks are stock phrases in American homes, schools, factories and offices. These terms for non-literary conversation are coined in picturesque, lusty slang and not a few of them appear in respectable works such as dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other books of reference: "Jew. One of the commonest ways of conveying the notion of swindling is through various uses of the word *jew* (by no means, of course, confined to school slang), which may be a verb, or a noun both personal and abstract"—(M. Marples, *Public School Slang,* 103). "Jew. 2. A person who seeks gain by sordid or crafty means; a hard-fisted money-lender, or tricky dealer; an opprobrious use: as, he is a regular *Jew.*" *(Century Dictionary and Cyclopedia,* V. 3230). "Jew. V. T. To overreach by sharp practice, cheating, or trickery; to practice imposition or extortion imputed to the Jews by those who dislike them." *(Webster's New International Dict.* 1334). Washington Irving is cited as having used this term: "Some mode of screwing and Jewing the world out of more interest than one's money is entitled to." (Murray, *A New Eng. Dict. of Hist. Principles,* V. 577)

The term Jew is employed as a synonym for baseness and infamy and is applied to everyone regarded as disreputable and vile: *"Jew.* 3. an opprobrious use of general application, irrespective of race." (Vizetelly, *Practical Standard Dict. of the English Language,* 672)

The most widespread invention of the Defamers is the "Jewish nose." This device is utilized in cartoons, posters, jokes and other ideological vehicles. The "Jewish nose" is portrayed as the beak of the birds of prey to convey the idea of rapacity. The invention was perhaps suggested by Hittite pictographs. That the "Jewish nose" is not Jewish is known to many people. "The Jew is caricatured with a Hittite nose exactly as the Irishman is caricatured with the jaw of a Spanish muleteer." (G. B. Shaw, cited in *Jewish Daily Bulletin,* Jan. 11, 1926). The "Jewish nose" is far more common among the Aztecs and some other Indian tribes than among the Jews.

The mythical Virgin Mary, Jesus and the Apostles are described, generally, as having been Jews. St. Peter, so the story goes, was a Jewish fisherman of Galilee. Some wit even remarked that when Rome adopted Christianity it merely exchanged Jupiter for Jew Peter. Were the ruling Christian nobles, the Church, and later the bourgeoisie, consistent, they would have had their artists paint Jesus and other Christian figures with hooked noses, the supposed characteristic of the Jews. Logically, if the Jews did have such a racial characteristic

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

it would have been more pronounced in the era of the Jewish kingdom than after two thousand years of thorough dispersion and mixture with virtually all existing races and nationalities. Yet the artists of the ruling Christian powers have been portraying the Madonna, Jesus, the Apostles and various "saints" with average noses. And, since Christianity accepts the old, Hebrew Testament, they did not paint the legendary figures of Judaism with hooked noses. Michelangelo's "Moses," "Jeremiah," "Isaiah" and "Head of Jehova" have ordinary human noses. "The Rabbi" by Rembrandt does not look like a "Jew" in the traditional Defamation sense, neither does Raphael's "Isaiah."

Proportionately, in actual life, no more Jews have "Jewish noses" than do Gentiles. Disraeli, the Rothschilds, Cremieux, Lassalle, Heine, Marx, Sarah Bernhardt, Leon Blum and thousands of other famous Jews had no hook-noses. On the other hand when one looks through the portraits of nobles or dignitaries of the Church the eye is occasionally arrested by a "Jewish nose." Such for example is the nose of Henry IV of Navarre. Among the modern famous non-Jewish faces, Ferdinand of Bulgaria, the British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain, the Shah of Iran possess what is known as a "Jewish nose."

The German, Polish and other Defamers in their anti-Semitic caricatures graft the "Jewish nose" onto the faces of Trotsky and other Jewish Marxists and onto the faces of the bourgeois Jewish public figures. With Rosa Luxemburg, a Jewess, they have no difficulty, for she had a "Jewish nose," but they do not ridicule the hooked nose of the famous Polish composer, Frederic Chopin, which was an exact replica of hers. In Germany, just before Hitler was placed in power, "In November 1932, 182 German theatres refused to employ any Jewish artists. Non-Jews of Semitic countenance were dismissed from their posts as well." (*J. D. B.* Jan. 9, 1933). Had Hitler issued orders to his bandits to determine who was a Jew by the "Jewish nose," the vast majority of the six million murdered Jews would have been exempt from extermination and, conversely, a host of Gentiles with the "Jewish nose" would have found themselves in the gas chambers. And yet the Gentile bourgeoisie adopted this part of Defamation as a supposed characteristic of the Jews: "*Jewing*, in allusion to the curvation recognized as characteristic of the Jewish noses."(*Century Dict. and Cyclopedia,* V, 3231). "*Jewing*. From supposed resemblance to the hooked nose of a Jew." (Murray, V. 578)

The "Jewish nose" figures prominently in American slang. There is a whole number of expressions synonymous with Jew and among them we underscore those alluding to the "Jewish nose." "Jew . . . cloak-and-suitor . . . herring punisher, *hook-nose* . . ." (L. V. Berrey and M. van den Bark, *The American Thesaurus of Slang,* 359). Sometimes a Jew is called simply *nose:* "The use of *nose* for a Jew is reported in the student slang of Ohio State University, but it is very rare elsewhere." (H. L. Mencken, *The American Language,* Supp. I, 617). The American anti-Semites display as much agility in using the "Jewish

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

nose" as their European colleagues. On July 29, 1939 a "Christian movie" was shown. A commentator accompanied it with Defamatory running patter: "Look at that beak! Watch those kikes! If I had a nose like that I'd kill myself!" (Cited in *Christian Social Action,* Sept. 1939, 111)

The "Jewish nose" is sometimes found in works of most respected authors. Thus, in the "Bishop and the Busman" *(The Bab Ballads,* McKay pub. 35-6), W. S. Gilbert of the famous Gilbert and Sullivan team uses the "nose" in describing a Jewish bus-driver:

"His nose, and name, and beard became
a byword on that road."

And after the Jew was persuaded by the Bishop to become a Christian:

"The organ which, in man,
Between the eyebrows grows,
Fell from his face, and in its place
He found a Christian nose."

Guy de Maupassant in *Mademoiselle Fifi* wrote—"a Jewess, whose snub nose confirmed by exception the rule which allots hooked noses to all her race."

While the so-called "Jewish nose" characterizes the Jew only in imagination, certain cannibal groups in the Pacific Islands actually possess an arched nose. The bourgeois "scientists" named these cannibals *Black Jews.* The dictionary automatically conveys this anti-Semitic poison: *"Black Jew.* One of the natives of the Solomon Islands or some other Melanesian group, whose noses resemble the Jewish nose." *(Webster's* 280)

While Peter and other apostles as well as Jesus, are never spoken of as Jews, Judas Iscariot, because of the infamy attached to his name, is connected with the term Jew in various ways. *"Judas.* 4. Like Judas Iscariot or his character or conduct, traitorous, as Judas attack, Jew, kiss, trick." (Murray, V. 616). "H. Vaughan *Silex Scint.,* Rules 8 @ *Lessons* 45 Who sells Religion, is a Judas Jew." *(Ib.).* Gradually through the centuries the terms *Judas* and *Jew* became identical. "Judas had become the criminal par excellence. His very name suggests the Jews. Consequently, the legends about him were turned against them. Judas, the disciple of Jesus, became Judas, the Jew!" (H. Sinsheimer, *Shylock,* 115). As we have shown, Fourier, in the passage so admired by Engels, called the Jewish merchant *Judas Iscariot.* The Jews, to whom, as the fiction goes, Jesus was betrayed, are naturally no better than Judas: "For thirty pence our Savior was sold among the false Jews." (T. Percy, cited, J. Bartlett in *Familiar Quotations,* 257)

The part of the Defamation portraying the Jews as being inordinately avaricious is graphically conveyed by the following term: *"Jew's eye,* anything exceedingly valuable, or for which a medieval Jew would have borne the loss of an eye." (Funk and Wagnall's *New Standard Dict.* 1319)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The linking of the Jews with money gave rise to the following expression: "Jew, As rich as a: from the mistaken belief that all, or most, Jews are rich." (A. M. Hayamson, *Dict. of Eng. Phrases,* 203). Byron *(Blues,* 1, 77) says, "You forget Lady Lilac's as rich as a Jew." Jonathan Swift improved upon this by coining the phrase "richer than a Jew." However, the Defamers work the thing two ways: cheap articles are also termed to be *Jewish.* Thus, *"Jew's harp . . .* Webster says it is simply *Jew* plus *harp.* The implication is that the instrument is somewhat cheaper than a regular harp." (A. H. Holt, *Phrase Origins,* 190)

To gauge the extent to which the Defamation has entered the everyday life of the United States one need merely observe the use of the phrase *to Jew down.* The meaning of the expression is "to force to reduce a price by insistent bargaining. *Slang." (Webster's,* 1334). Slang or not, the phrase is employed in all phases of social activity. Mark Twain, wrote: "There is one thing in this world which a person don't ever try to jew you down on. That's a coffin." (Craige, III, 1341). If the attempt to reduce the price of goods is termed to *jew down,* the person who is making such an attempt is termed a *Jew: "Bargainer.* Chiz, chiz-artist, Jew." *(Am. Thesaurus of Slang,* 521)

And what could Jew-bail mean in common American parlance? *"Jew-bail.* Insufficient or worthless bail." (E. Partridge, *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English,* 438). To be intimate is to be "thick as two Jews on a pay-day." *(Ib.)*

A miser or an avaricious person is derogatorily called a *Jew:* "Selfish or greedy person . . . Jew, kike, mean cuss, nab, pig, sheeny, wanter, yid." *(Am. Th. of S.* 370). A clothing store is a "Jew joint" (523). A Jewish street peddler or a buyer of junk is smeared with the "Fagin" colors in slang English: *"Jew fencer.* A Jewish street buyer or salesman, esp. of stolen goods." (Partridge, 438)

To study business administration in Defamatory terms means to take up Jewish engineering. (Berrey, Bark, 776). *"Jewish engineering* —Courses in business administration." (M. H. W Weseen, *Dict. of Am. Slang.* 187)

In slang, paper money is called *"Jew flags." (Am. Th. of S.* 535). *"Jew Flag.* A dollar bill; any paper money. A play on the Hebrew's well-known ability to make money." (G. Irwin, *American Tramp and Underworld Slang,* 1931, 109). Jews and money are always linked together by the Defamers. The following complaint about an arithmetic textbook was sent to the editor of a Jewish bourgeois paper:

"Sir:—On looking over a book of Arithmetical Examples in use by my younger daughter, I find the following:—'A Jew discounts a bill of $180 drawn at 4 months, at 60 per cent per annum, and insists on giving in part payment five dozen of wine which he charges at four guineas a dozen, and a picture which he charges at 19 pounds. How much ready money does he pay? If the cost to the Jew of the wine and the picture be only one-fourth of the sum he has charged

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

for them, what is the real rate of interest the Jew has been charging?' This occurs in a book by a well-known arithmetical author, the Rev. Barnard Smith, M.A., late Rector of Glastom Uppingaam, and is published by Messrs. MacMillan and Co." *(Jewish Chronicle,* June 15, 1894)

Sometimes the Defamation does not appear in the definition itself but in the illustrations of usage. This can be readily observed in one explanation of the term *Jewry: "Jewry.* The land of the Jews. Judea. After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in *Jewry,* because the Jews sought to kill him. John VII.I." *(Cent. Dict.* etc. V, 3230)

There is an infinite variety to the forms of Defamation. A repulsive-looking, voracious grouper has been named *Jewfish.* "The name of the Jewfish, chief cause of annoyance to Charles E. Townsend, managing director of the New York Aquarium in Battery Park, has been changed to June Fish, and employees began changing the signs above the star border's tank. Mr. Townsend said the change was made in response to the protests of Jews that a fish 'so ugly and so named was an insult to their race.' " *(J. D. B.* July 28, 1927)

However, in the dictionaries the old name has been retained. One can only surmise how an Englishman or a Frenchman or an Irishman would react if he saw an ugly creature in a tank over which hung a sign *Frenchman fish* or *Irishman fish.*

There is also *"Jew lizard* . . . so called because its gular pouch suggests a beard." *(Webster's* 1335). And *"Jew monkey.* Any of several species of sakis and macaques." *(Ib.).* And "Jew-crow. The chough, also the hooded crow; each more fully called market-Jew crow." *(Century,* V. 3230)

Often when importuned by Jewish bourgeois organizations the publishers of dictionaries or phrase collections promise to eliminate the Defamation in the future editions. Thus: "The definition of the word, Jew, in the English language will be modified in the new edition of the famous Oxford Dictionary, according to the decision of the publishers. The present definition contains remarks which are offensive to the Jews." *(J. D. B.,* Oct. 24, 1924). But in the 1933 edition of the Oxford Dictionary the Defamation was retained: *"Jew,* v. To cheat or overreach, in the way attributed to Jewish traders or usurers." (577)

Even some miniature editions of dictionaries find room to squeeze in Defamation:

"Pocket Anti-Semitism. An instance of the 'higher anti-Semitism,' a phrase coined by Dr. Solomon Schechter . . . is revealed in a recent editorial in our London contemporary, the *Jewish Chronicle.* It calls attention to a letter from a correspondent who says that in the 'Pocket Oxford Dictionary' compiled by F. G. and H. W. Fowler, the word 'Jew' is stated as meaning 'unscrupulous usurer' or 'bargainer' or, as a verb, to cheat, overreach . . . Jewry is represented as a place in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which unscrupulous usurers and bargainers reside, a resort of cheats and overreachers! The meaning thus applied to the word 'Jew' is printed in this 'Dictionary' without any reservation, such as denoting that the word is so used opprobriously, as is done, for instance, in another popular word-book, 'Chambers' Century Dictionary' . . . The publication is one that is likely to have considerable circulation, and will thus help to spread the poison of anti-Semitism, something that a dictionary, of all publications, should scrupulously avoid." *(American Hebrew,* Nov. 7, 1924, 840)

In *Roget's Thesaurus* published in 1939 by the Thomas Y. Crowell Company a note states: "In the original edition Roget included the word Jew in several groups of synonyms. In this printing all uncomplimentary racial allusions have been omitted." (587). However even in this "purified" edition a true anti-Jewish allusion was retained: "usurer, Shylock." (339). In the 1940 "New Revised Edition" of *Roget's Thesaurus* put out by The World Publishing Company the following anti-Semitic synonyms are given: "usurer, Jew, Shylock" (293), "miser, niggard, harpy, extortioner, Jew." (302). The Grosset and Dunlap revised 1941 edition of *Roget's* also contain Defamatory allusions.

Every dictionary of distinctly Christian content and character carries in one form or another an attack on the Jews. Thus: " 'For fear of the Jews' men hesitated to confess Christ. (J. 1:13.9:22)." (J. Hasting, *A Dict. of Christ and the Gospels,* 861). Some editors compile citations from writers, and the Defamation is frequently found in these compilations. Thus: "Tacitus, *Annals,* Bk. V. Sec. 13 (C.A.D. 116) Jews are not fit for Heaven, but on earth they are most useful.

"George Eliot, *The Spanish Gypsy.* Bk I (1868) How odd of God to choose the Jews.

"The dream of the Jews—not to work with the hands! Henry Miller, *The Cosmological Eye,* p. 28. (1939)

"A crabbed Jew—a creature that quarrels with sound human food. Rutilius Namatianus, *De Reditu Suo.* Bk. I, I. 383 (C.A.D. 416)." (Burton Stevenson, *The Home Book of Proverbs, Maxims and Familiar Phrases,* 1269)

Some of the citations are not familiar phrases, but an attempt is made to popularize them. George Eliot's verse, it may be argued, does not truly represent her actual feeling toward the Jews. However, she left a clear proof of her anti-Semitism: "Everything specifically Jewish is of a low grade." (Cited by J. W. Cross in *George Eliot's Life as related in her Letters and Journals,* I, 125). As to Henry Miller, one can find in his *Cosmological Eye* such phrases as "a louse from a Jew's beard." (351)

In 1942 H. L. Mencken published *A Dictionary of Quotations* which bristles with Defamation: "Our English proverb: to look like a Jew, whereby is meant sometimes a weather-beaten, wasp-like fellow,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sometimes a frenetic and lunatic person, sometimes one discontended. Thomas Coryat. Crudities, 1611" (611). "To undo a Jew is charity, and not sin. Christopher Marlowe, The Jew of Malta." "Wherever there is money there are Jews. C. L. De Montesque: *Persian Letters,* L. X, 1721" (611). "The Jews . . . both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God, and are contrary to all men. Thessalonians II, 14-15, c 51" (610). "A race in which ability seems as natural and hereditary as the curve of their noses. J. R. Lowell: *Democracy,* 1884 (Address in Birmingham, England, Oct. 6)" (612). "When a Jew smiles at a Moslem it is a sign that he is preparing to cheat him. Moroccan proverb." (613). "Wars are the Jew's harvests. Werner Sombart: *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben,* 1911" (612)

The following anti-Semitic proverbs are from S. G. Champion's *Racial Proverbs:* "He that would cheat a Jew must be a Jew. Trade has spoilt the Jews and the Jews have spoilt trade." ("German," 170). "Nothing is worse than a poor Jew, lean pork or a drunken woman." ("Hungarian" 198). "The peasant earns, the aristocrat spends, and the Jew profits." ("Polish" 245). "In misfortune even a Jew can be looked upon as a brother." (p. 244). "Punish the Jew with a whip and the peasant with money." *(Ib.).* "Deceive a Jew and he will kiss you; kiss a Jew and he will deceive you." ("Russian" 263). "If a Jew can have the rope free of charge he will let himself be hanged." "When you baptize a Jew keep him under water." *(Ib.).* "To murder a Jew is to remove forty sins from off one's soul." ("Ukrainian," 275)

Profiting by the prevalence of superstitious beliefs among the masses, charlatans put out fortune-telling books, dream-interpretation books and similar literature. These shoddy products often are permeated with Defamation: *Palmer's 'Skin Success' Mystery Dream Book,* for instance, interprets a dream with Jews in it thus: "To see Jews in your dream, or to have business dealings with them, indicates that you will be deceived." (100). If a man dreams of a Gentile woman it may mean romance, but not if he dreams of a Jewess according to Defamation: "To dream of a Jewess signifies the alteration of your condition from good to bad, and from bad to worse." (Aunt Sally's *Policy Players' Dream Book and Wheel of Fortune,* 85)

A considerable amount of Defamation is directly connected with the mention of New York City because of its large Jewish population. If a visitor to New York were to consult *Rand McNally Company Guide to Places of Interest in the City and Environs* he would learn that the East Side, the ghetto of the City, was called Judea, inhabitted by shoddy people: "Here in 'Judea' the fakers and peddlers who throng the lower part of the town get their supplies and learn how to earn their livelihood even before they have any idea of the language of the country." (Cited in *The Congress Bulletin,* April 5, 1935). A very striking piece of Defamation of the Jews of New York

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

is B. R. Newton's poem *Owed to New York* (1906) cited in Bartlett's *Familiar Quotations:*

> "Bedwarfed the man, o'ergrown the brute,
> Ruled by Jew and prostitute;
> Purple-robbed and pauper-clad,
> Raving, rotting, money-mad;
> A squirming heard in Mammon's mesh,
> A wilderness of human flesh;
> Crazed with avarice, lust and rum,
> New York, thy name's Delirium." (759)

Presumably objective encyclopedias give anti-Semitic definitions of the Jews. Thus: "Among the distinguishing mental and moral traits of the Jews may be mentioned: A distaste for hard or violent physical labor; . . . capacity for exploitation, both individual and social; shrewdness and astuteness in speculation and money matters generally; an Oriental love of display and a full appreciation of the power and pleasure of social position." *(New Int. Enc.* XII, 678). And the implied explanation for all these nefarious traits and activities is that the Jews have "a very high average of intellectual ability."

The *Catholic Encyclopedia* "subtly" defends the Inquisition and Torquemada, the chief exterminator of the Jews in Spain: "The Marranos committed serious outrages against Christianity and endeavored to Judaize the whole of Spain . . . Whether Torquemada's ways of ferreting out and punishing heretics were justifiable is a matter that has to be decided not only by comparison with the penal standards of the fifteenth century, but also, and chiefly, by an inquiry into their necessity for the preservation of Christian Spain. The contemporary Spanish chronicler, Sebastian de Olmedo (Chronicon magistrorum generalium Ordinis Praedicatorum, fol. 80-81), calls Torquemada 'the hammer of heretics, the light of Spain, the savior of his country, the honor of his order.' " (XIV, 783). Condoning the black crimes of the Church against the Jews, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* at the same time plays up a pretended tolerance and under this guise manipulates various anti-Jewish charges in such a skillful fashion as to make them appear true: "History proves indeed that Church authorities exercised at times considerable pressure upon the Jews to promote their conversion; but it also proves that the same authorities generally deprecated the use of violence for the purpose. It bears witness, in particular, to the untiring and energetic efforts of the Roman pontiffs in behalf of the Jews especially when, threatened or actually pressed by persecution, they appealed to the Holy See for protection. It chronicles the numerous protestations of the popes against mob violence against the Jewish race, and thus directs the attention of the student of history to the real cause of the Jewish persecutions, viz., the popular hatred against the children of Israel. Nay more, it discloses the principal causes of that hatred, among which the following may be mentioned: (1) The deep and wide racial difference between

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Jews and Christians which was, moreover, emphasized by the ritual and dietary laws of Talmudic Judaism; (2) the mutual religious antipathy which prompted the Jewish masses to look upon the Christians as idolators, and the Christians to regard the Jews as the murderers of the Divine Saviour of mankind, and to believe readily the accusations of the use of Christian blood in the celebration of the Jewish Passover, the desecration of the Holy Eucharist, etc.; (3) the trade rivalry which caused Christians to accuse the Jews of sharp practice, and to resent their clipping of the coinage, their usury, etc.; (4) the patriotic susceptibilities of the particular nations in the midst of which the Jews have usually formed a foreign element, and to the respective interests of which their devotion has not always been beyond suspicion. In view of these and other more or less local, more or less *justified,* reasons, one can readily understand how the popular hatred of the Jews has too often defeated the beneficent efforts of the Church, and notably of its supreme pontiffs, in regard to them." (VIII, 404. Our emphasis—G. S.)

Another Catholic reference work by means of clever double-talk covers up the Church with respect to the Blood Accusation: *"Ritual murder.* The killing of a Christian child in fulfilment of some rite, a slanderous and impounded accusation made against the Jews for many centuries. It was condemned as false by the Holy See twice in the 13th century and again by Pope Clement XIV in 1756, while he was still a consultor of the Holy Office. Those young victims of Jews whose local *cultus* as martyrs the Church has approved (e.g. Little St. Hugh of Lincoln, St. William of Norwich, St. Andrew of Rinn) are regarded as having been put to death out of hatred of the faith by individual Jews and not in pursuance of any Jewish rite." *(A Catholic Dictionary,* Edited by Donald Attwater, 435)

In 1925 The Macmillan Company of New York published *An Anthology of Catholic Poets.* The most conspicuous piece of Defamation in it is an excerpt from Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales:*

"There was in Asia, in a great city,
Amonges Christen folk a Jewery . . .
Hateful to Christ and to his company . . .
Our firste foe, the serpent Satanas,
That hath in Jewes heart his waspes nest . . .
From thence forth the Jewes have conspired . . .
And as the child gan forby for the pace,
This cursed Jew him hente and held him fast,
And cut his throat and in a pit him cast.
I say that in a wardrobe they him threw
Whereas these Jewes purgen their entrail . . .
This poor widow awaiteth all that night
After her little child, but he came nought; . . .
With mother's pity in her breast enclosed
She goeth, as she were half out of her mind, . . .

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Among the cursed Jewes she him sought . . .
With torment and with shameful death each one
This Provost doth these Jewes for to starve . . .
And after that he hung them by the law . . .
The convent eke lay on the pavement
Weeping and herien Christes Mother dear
And after that they rise and forth been went
And took away this Martyr from his bier,
And in a tomb of marblestones clear
Enclosen they his little body sweet;
There he is now, God leave us for to meet." (42, f)

Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* is required reading in most colleges of the United States.

Incidentally, William Wordsworth, a celebrated English poet laureate, modernized this tale in his "Selections from Chaucer." Some of the modernization reads: "This cruel Jew him seized, and held him fast and cut his throat and in a pit him cast . . . She cried, till to the Jewry she was brought,And him among the accursed Jews she sought . . . Young Hew of Lincoln! in like sort laid low by cursed Jews—thing well and widely known." *(The Poetical Works of Wordsworth,* ed. H. Reed, 442, 443)

Encyclopedias and dictionaries have never explained the true idea represented by the fictitious "Jews" in world literature. They can hardly reveal that the portrayals of the mythical "Jews" serve to infect with anti-Semitism the ideology of every class in modern society. They, rather, harmoniously collaborate with the Defamers, directly in line with the political requirements of Capitalism: *"Barabas.* In Marlowe's *Jew of Malta,* the chief character, rapacious Jew." *(Webster's* 217). *"Fagin.* In Dickens's *Oliver Twist,* a villainous old Jew who acts as a fence, or receiver of stolen goods, and who trains boys and girls to be pickpockets." (909). "The Artful Dodger takes the starving lad to the den of Fagin the Jew, the pickpocket's school." *(Library of the World's Best Literature,* H. W. Mabie, L. G. Runkle, G. H. Werner, editors, XLIV, 48). *"Trilby.* The title and heroine of a novel (1894) by George du Maurier. She is a Parisian laundress and model, who under the hypnotic influence of Svengali, a repulsive but musically gifted Austrian Jew . . ." *(Webster's,* 2712)

The Jewish bourgeoisie has crystallized many types of indirect supporters of Defamation. In a dictionary *Anglo-Russki Slovar* by A. Alexandrov, issued by the Hebrew Publishing Company of New York, the word *Jew* is defined as *to deceive, to cheat,* (412). A dream-interpreting book edited by one Max Stein says: "To dream of conversing with a Jew: deceit, direct or indirect." *(Triple and Harmony Number Combinations Dream Dictionary,* 1940, 138). These definitions have undoubtedly been included to show that the Jews are not rejecting the "accepted" meaning of the term *Jew.*

One may have the feeling that the dictionaries and encyclopedias

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

containing anti-Semitic definitions and remarks are merely impartial compilations of usage in society and are not spreading the Defamation. But a dictionary which gives "cheat," "usurer," "Shylock" and similar opprobrious words as the *actual* meaning of and synonyms for *Jew* and does not explain that these are anti-Semitic usages of the word designed for the purpose of hounding the Jewish Scapegoat group, is factually spreading anti-Semitism. Since from childhood Gentile workers and the bourgeoisie are fed on anti-Jewish tales connected with the origin of Christianity, on anti-Jewish humor and on anti-Jewish social-economic and political accusations, it is fairly simple to realize the effect on their mentality when, as a supplement to all the misteachings on the subject of Jews, they open an authoritative book on information and find substantiation of these misteachings.

7. *Blood Accusation in the United States and Canada*

In 1928 an event occurred in the United States which is indicative of the "education" conducted by the bourgeoisie. "On Saturday, September 22nd, a four year old girl, the daughter of one of the residents of Massena in St. Lawrence County, New York, disappeared; on the following day, after a search for the child had proved vain, a State trooper interrogated one of the Jewish residents of the village and also the rabbi of the congregation as to whether the custom exists among the Jews to offer human sacrifice, in connection, presumably, with the Yom Kippur holiday which was to be ushered in on the evening of that day. The rabbi indignantly resented the implication of this question, and later the trooper stated that the Mayor had been consulted on the matter and that it was he who had suggested that the rabbi be called to police headquarters for questioning . . . The American Jewish Committee and the American Jewish Congress and other organizations took up this matter with the Mayor of the town and with the State authorities, vigorously protesting against the action taken by the Mayor and the State trooper, which, by giving countenance to a slander against the Jewish people which had in the past caused much suffering, threatened to spread this heinous superstition of the Dark Ages in the United States. Mr. Louis Marshall, the President of the American Jewish Committee, demanded a public apology from the Mayor and insisted that the State trooper who questioned the rabbi be disciplined." (*American Jewish Year Book,* 1929-30, 21-22). In a letter to the press Louis Marshall said: "Fortunately, the little girl was found before official irresponsibility culminated in mob violence." (350)

Nobody raised the most interesting question. Where did the State trooper and the Mayor get the notion that the Jewish group used human blood for ritual purposes? Naturally they themselves did not invent this criminal accusation. Unquestionably the answer resides in the fact that even the most "progressive" bourgeois writers lend

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

credence to this libel. The accusation has been disseminated in the highest educational circles, as attested by the following virtually open Blood Accusation occurring in a famous Left Liberal "objective" work:

"In the mediaeval and modern times many accusations of ritual murders, as they are called, have been brought against the Jews, and the arguments for and against the charge have been discussed on both sides with a heat which, however natural, has tended rather to inflame the passions of the disputants than to elicit the truth. Into this troubled arena I prefer not to enter; I will only observe that, so far as I have looked into the alleged cases, and these are reported in sufficient detail, the majority of the victims are said to have been children and to have met their fate in spring, often in the week before Easter. This last circumstance points, if there is any truth in the accusations, to a connection of the human sacrifice with the Passover, which falls in this week, rather than with Purim, which falls a month earlier. Indeed it has often been made a part of the accusation that the blood of the youthful victims was intended to be used at the Passover. If all the charges of ritual murder which have been brought against the Jews in modern times are not, as seems most probable, mere idle calumnies [at this point on the margin of the page the publishers, evidently, state, "The accusations probably false." Even this "probably" leaves the door open for believing the accusations; however, the author himself leaves no doubt about his own half-veiled support to the libel—G. S.] . . . If deeds of the sort alleged have been really done by Jews—a question on which I must decline to pronounce an opinion—they would interest the student of custom as isolated instances of reversion to an old and barbarous ritual which once flourished commonly enough among the ancestors both of Jews and Gentiles, but on which, as on a noxious monster, an enlightened humanity has long set its heel. Such customs die hard; it is not the fault of society as a whole if sometimes the reptile has strength enough left to lift its venomous head and sting." (J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough,* VI, "The Scapegoat," Macmillan, N. Y. 1935, 395-6)

In Canada in 1932 a Defamers' organization "Goglu" conducted a violent campaign of Blood Accusations. "Under the caption 'The Jews are Assassins,' the anti-Semitic publication *Le Miroir* prints a lengthy article purporting to show that Jews kill Gentile children to use their blood for ritual purposes . . . The article is illustrated by a cartoon depicting a Jewish rabbi slaying a Christian child." *(J. D. B.,* July 10, 1932). In another article *Le Miroir* made an attempt to frame a Jewish bourgeois political leader: ". . . *Le Miroir* devotes space to an article against the Montreal Jewish Alderman Bernard Schwartz, making the accusation that Mr. Schwartz threatened to kill the editor of *Le Miroir* and to use his blood for ritual purposes on the Jewish Easter holidays." *(Ib.* July 27, 1932). "The Jewish Alderman Berl Schwartz, whom the anti-Semitic publication nicknames 'Matzohblood' Schwartz." *(Ib.* August 10, 1932)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The campaign to spread the belief that the Blood Accusation was true received support in the Canadian Parliament: "The Deputy speaker of the Canadian Parliament, Armon Laverne, sprang a sensational surprise today by upholding the anti-Jewish allegations of the anti-Semitic French-Canadian Goglu Organization." *(Ib.* July 27, 1932). " 'I am not an anti-Semite,' M. Laverne states. 'I am not interested in the Goglu campaign. I believe Jewish ritual murder is historically proven.' " *(Ib.* July 29, 1932)

The position taken by the Deputy speaker of the Canadian Parliament was echoed by a Liberal-philosophical British publication, the *Hibbert Journal,* several days after Laverne had made his shocking statement. A bitter comment appeared in certain Jewish bourgeois newspapers. "The Philadelphia Jewish Exponent also comments upon this matter in its current issue and in an editorial entitled: 'Maligned in a Friend's House,' says: 'The Hibbert Journal which has been consistently friendly and which is renowned throughout the world for its high standards of scholarship and its fairmindedness, lays itself open to criticism in its current issue. The otherwise splendid number of an esteemed publication is marred by a foot-note to an article in which the author says, among other things: "The charge of ritual murder persistently brought against the Jews and always dismissed as a malignant calumny is proved up to the hilt by their own Scriptures. It dates back to the second century B. C. It was their horrible practices that led Sholmaneser and Nebuchadnessar to expel them from Palestine and when they returned they were abhorred by all their neighbors, doubtless for the same reason." ' " *(Ib.* Aug. 14,1932)

8. *Growth of Anti-Jewish Discrimination in the United States*

Defamation of the Jews never operated abstractly but always tended to encourage concrete persecutions. In the United States this has been expressed in social and economic discrimination against the Jews which showed a marked increase in the Twenties, as a corollary of the first large-scale anti-Semitic crusade in America: "By a curious lapse of memory, most Americans have also forgotten that Ford's campaign was not an isolated adventure. In fact, it was part of a loosely organized nationwide anti-Semitic campaign, the first in American history . . . As Louis Marshall pointed out in a memorandum to Congress: . . . That the debate on the measure took the form of a discussion of 'quotas' and 'restriction' cannot disguise the fact that it was, in large part, aimed at the exclusion of further Jewish immigration. Proponents of the measure said that it was aimed at the Jews and suggested that 'we might just as well be frank about it.' Passage of this act marks a turning point in modern Jewish history." (Carey McWilliams, 35-36)

There were signs of an official plan to introduce the Tsarist

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

quota system for Jewish students at colleges. "A. L. Lowell, the President of the Harvard University, stirred a hornet's nest by suggesting *a numerus clausus* for Jews at Harvard." (O. J. Janowsky, *The American Jew,* 190-1). However, the ruling bourgeoisie was not ready to go beyond unofficial quotas for Jewish students. Some schools did not conceal their anti-Semitic attitude. (Broun, Britt, 87)

The exclusion of a great number of Jews from medical schools has by 1950 become a certainty: "If discrimination in the colleges is an ugly inconvenience for Jews, discrimination in admission to medical schools is a constantly burning wound. There is probably no Jew in this country who has not seen some friend or relative — qualified, talented, eager to be a physician—frustrated and embittered by a stream of rejection slips from medical schools." *(Commentary,* Feb. 1950, 179)

Discrimination against the Jews moved on in various directions of economic life, and was sometimes explained in a humorous sort of way. "Pressed to explain why (the) New York Telephone Company does not employ an 'equitable number' of Jews, one official replied that Jewish girls could not operate equipment 'because their arms are too short.' " (Cited from *Time Magazine* by J. Stemons in *As Victim to Victims,* 215)

There was testimony to anti-Jewish discrimination in the United States Government: "Expanding his criticism of the Foreign Service in a letter, Representative La Guardia said: 'I do not hesitate to say there is discrimination against Jews in the Department of State.' " (Broun, Britt, 273)

One must always draw a balance sheet of *words* and *deeds* of Left bourgeois democrats such as La Guardia. He frequently denounced anti-Semitism. When he was Mayor of New York an active anti-Semite named Drew was discovered in the police department. "Drew was suspended on charges of Christian Front activities, tried by the Corporation Council of the City, and found guilty on every front. Commissioner Herlands, who investigated the case for the Mayor of the City confirmed the findings of the Corporation Council. Despite this evidence, the Police Commissioner exonerated the anti-Semitic patrolman and reinstated him . . . The role of Mayor La Guardia who appointed secretly a special commission of three which whitewashed Drew is subject to much criticism." ("Anti-Semitic Wave in New York," *Opinion,* Feb. 1944, 14)

After the removal of the Nazis from power in Germany, discrimination against the Jews in the United States reached a new high. "That discrimination against Jews in employment has been steadily increasing since V-J Day has been clearly established by a number of recent studies." (Carey McWilliams, 158)

The discriminatory policy has not been confined to the Gentile bourgeoisie. A section of the Jewish bourgeoisie, aiming to please a clientele known to have an aversion for Jewish clerks or Jewish

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

professional men has bowed to the power of Defamation: "One of the gravest elements of our very difficult problem is the discriminatory attitude of some Jewish employers toward Jewish employees. When Jewish employers practice discrimination, they viciously weaken our approach toward non-Jewish employers." (J. X. Cohen, *Towards Fair Play for Jewish Workers,* 38)

To get around discrimination in employment some Jewish workers disguise themselves as Christians. "A priest, in the *Pittsburgh Catholic,* official organ of that diocese, in answer to my declaration at a public meeting of this fact, writes that the Jewish young women who wear crosses do so only out of a desire to be in style. What a failure to grasp the significance of the cross to the Jew! I believe Jewish young women who wear the cross do so to place the symbol of validity upon their false contention to fellow-workers that they are the non-Jews they claimed to be when, fearing discrimination, they obtained employment as non-Jews. They are being forced to resort to a twentieth century Marrano device. The world generally has retrogressed to the Dark Ages in so many ways, why be surprised at this manifestation? And then, too, many truly non-Jewish young women who are Jewish, so-called, in appearance, seek to overcome this employment handicap by wearing a cross to proclaim their non-Jewishness." (29)

In fields other than employment, many Jews, workers and capitalists, feeling the pressure of the spreading persecution, attempt to escape by concealing their Jewish identity. The preface to the first edition of *Who's Who in American Jewry* (1926) revealed: "Unfortunately, some persons preferred to be omitted rather than associate their names with those of their racial colleagues. A few even rejected with indignation the proposal of being included in a volume where their Jewish identity would become a matter of public knowledge." "Karl Landsteiner, another American Nobel prize-winner, in medicine, actually sued the Biogrophical Encyclopedia of American Jews for including him as a Jew." (Leo Jung, *Israel of Tomorrow,* 421)

9. *Imported and Domestic Literary Anti-Semitism in the United States*

In 1927 Dodd, Mead and Co. of New York issued a compilation *The Golden Tales* of Anatole France, an author greatly admired by the Marxists, both Bolsheviks and Social Democrats. In one of the tales, "The Procurator of Judea," Anatole France writes a dialogue between Pontius Pilate who, according to the mythology of the Scriptures, would not take it upon himself to try and execute Jesus, and Pilate's old friend Lamia. France has Pilate speak of "that depressing place Jerusalem, where the Jews filled me with bitterness and disgust." "Suavity towards the Jews!" cries Pontius Pilate, "Although you have lived amongst them, it seems clear that you ill

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

understand those enemies of the human race. Haughty and at the same time base, combining an invincible obstinacy with a despicably mean spirit, they weary alike your love and your hatred." Lamia who is portrayed as "defending" the Jews, says, nevertheless, "But I own that I never experienced any lively sympathy for the Jews."

In "The Miracle of St. Nicholas" Anatole France speaks of the "filthy Jews in the black lanes of the Ghetto" who practiced "the art of clipping coins"; and just before an enemy army entered the city the Jews robbed the cathedral: "The victorious army . . . sacked the churches, and took from the cathedral all that the Jews had left there, which, truth to tell, was not much."

In the *Revolt of the Angels,* Anatole France refers to the Jewish god Jehova in terms of "the old Jew drunk with vengenance." (207)

Of all the contemporary bourgeois dramatists, probably George Bernard Shaw has made the strongest impression on the radical petty-bourgeoisie and advanced elements among the workers of the United States as well as of other countries. Shaw was a Fabian Marxist and a sympathizer of the Stalin regime. In his play *Geneva* Shaw puts into the mouth of one of his characters, Sir Orpheus the following: "Only the Jews, with the business faculty peculiar to their race, will profit by our despair." (104). Blended into the play and served up through the medium of a fiction character this bit of Shaw's literary anti-Semitism would have left his own reputation unblemished had it not been for some incidents which revealed his personal anti-Semitism. Thus:

"George Bernard Shaw Termed 'Dear Anti-Semite' by Henry Bernstein, French Jewish writer. London, Nov. 17—The term 'Dear Socialist, multi-millionaire and anti-Semite' is applied to George Bernard Shaw by Henri Bernstein, famous French writer, in a controversy over what was termed the 'provincialism of France," according to a report reprinted in the London 'Morning Post' of an exchange of letters between Shaw and Bernstein, published in the Paris 'Le Temps.'

"George Bernard Shaw . . . turning upon M. Bernstein, who drives past in his expensive car, and stigmatizing him as 'The real enemy, the invader from the East, the Druze, the Riffian, the Oriehtal parasite, in a word, the Jew,' the 'Morning Post' quotes." *(J. D. B.* Dec. 3, 1925)

In this case Shaw apparently lost his temper. But he could also be anti-Semitic by pretending to be assinine and farcical: "Force Jews to Wed 'Aryans' is Shaw's Advice to Germany." *(Ib.* July 1, 1935)

Three years later reports came about this Fabian Socialist giving the Hitler salute and heaping praise on the leader of the Nazis:

"Mr. Shaw has often been a conundrum to our more ordinary folk, and never more so than with regard to his attitude toward Hitler and Nazism. He has induldged in glowing praise of the Nazi dictator, has described Austro-German Anschluss as 'a highly desirable event' and has publicly given the Hitler salute . . . 'I appreciate,'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

he declares, 'the political sagacity and courage with which he (Hitler) has rescued Germany from the gutter and placed her once more at the head of Central Europe.' " *(American Hebrew,* July 15, 1938)

Shaw did more for the Nazis than "merely" saluting them. He indirectly aided them to maintain a vindicating air for having burned six million Jews. After the Hitler regime was removed from power—"The Jewish Chronicle also reports that an anti-Semitic outburst took place in the Municipal Theatre in Flensburg, in the British zone in Germany, during a performance of George Bernard Shaw's 'St. Joan.' The audience applauded stormily when one of the characters, a monk, said that if it were up to him, all the Jews in Christendom would be burned." *(Jewish Exponent,* April 5, 1946). The exact words of the chaplain—not a monk—read: "It is all these scoundrels of Jews: they get in every time money changes hands. I would not leave a Jew alive in Christendom if I had my way." One of Shaw's characters in *St. Joan* "defends" the Jews by replying to the chaplain: "The Jews generally give value. They make you pay; but they deliver the goods."

Sigmund Freud's works were received with general favor by the advanced elements in the United States. His ideas became a guide in the treatment of emotional disturbances. But into this apparently sober diagnosis of psychic phenomena, Freud, himself a Jew, injected anti-Semitism by illustrating his points with "Jewish" jokes: "We demand no patent of nobility for our examples, nor do we make inquiries about their origin. The only qualifications we require are that they should make us laugh and serve our theoretical interest. It is to be remarked that both these demands are satisfied best by Jewish jokes." *(The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud,* 1938, 657). Here is one of the jokes which made Freud laugh and which served his "theoretical" interests. Prefacing it with "it is a 'bath' joke treating of the dread which some Jews are said to have for bathing" — he goes on: "Two Jews meet near a bathing establishment. 'Have you taken a bath?' asked one. 'How is that?' replies the other. 'Is one missing?' " (657-8). Another Freudian illustrative joke about the Jews is on the same theme: "Two Jews were conversing about bathing. 'I take a bath once a year,' said one, 'whether I need one or not.' It is clear that this boastful assurance of his cleanliness only betrays his state of uncleanliness." (674). Why did Freud utilize the device of "Two Jews" instead of "two men"? How these jokes are particularly "Jewish" is very difficult to see. It would be in order to apply a little basic *political* psychoanalysis to Freud himself. The title of the chapter containing these "Jewish" jokes is "Wit and its Relation to the Unconscious." *Was* Freud's usage of anti-Jewish wit unconscious?

Freud in his work *Moses and Monotheism* repeated the Defamation fable, given current to by Sellin, Goethe and others, that the Jews murdered Moses, the imaginative figure who, according to Jewish religious mythology, led them out of Egyptian slavery. (94, 141). Developing his refined anti-Semitic ideas, Freud by means of "psycho-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

analytical" phrases tells the reader that in a sense the charge that the Jews-killed-Our-Lord is true. (138-142)

Incidentally, many writers before and after Freud employed the "Jewish" joke technique of Defamation. Thus, W. S. Gilbert, of the Gilbert and Sullivan team, wrote in December 1910 to Mrs. Talbot: "I heard a good Jew story the other day. A man was discussing Noah's Ark. He said: 'I can concede a good deal. I can concede the kangaroo driven all the way from Australia. I can concede the Polar bears brought from the North Pole. I can concede a giraffe with his head and neck stuck through the ventilator. But what I cannot swallow is there being eight Jews and only two fleas among them.' " (Quoted by S. Dark and R. Grey in *W. S. Gilbert, His Life and Letters,* 180). On occasion a "Jewish" joke has been used in the United States Congress: "A member from the far West in order to illustrate the use of fiat money told in Congress the old fad anecdote of a Jewish father who left considerable wealth to his son, and as the story goes on to say, requested his heir to deposit $500 in his coffin. The son went to the Rabbi, after his father's death and related the incident, who told him to carry out the request of his father by placing a check for the amount in his coffin. Here, said the eloquent statesman, we must go to the Jews to learn how to be relieved from financial distress." *(American Israelite,* Apr. 4, 1895)

Pseudo-scientific literature, both bourgeois and Marxist, acts as a powerful vehicle for Defamation. An eminent German professor, Ernst Haeckel, wrote a book *The Riddle of the Universe* in which he ostensibly sought to replace religion with science. The work was translated and published in the United States in 1900 by Harper and Bros. Haeckel not only supported the "Christ" legend but also gave impetus to the myth about the supposed superiority of the Aryan race: "The statement of the apocryphal gospels, that the Roman officer, Pandera, was the true father of Christ, seems all the more credible when we make a careful anthropological study of the personality of Christ. He is generally regarded as purely Jewish. Yet the characteristics which distinguish his high and noble personality, and which give a distinct impress to his religion, are certainly not Semitical; they are rather features of the higher Arian race, and especially of its noblest branch, the Hellenes." (328)

Many years later Dr. Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda chief, repeated the thesis of non-Jewish origin of the mythical Jesus: "Christ cannot possibly have been a Jew. I don't have to prove that scientifically. It is a fact." (Cited by J. Gunther, *Inside Europe,* 68)

Unquestionably one of the most respected historians-Defamers is Edward Gibbon. In *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* repeating the vilifications of the Ancient historian of Rome, Dion Cassius, he presents the Jews, who rose against the Roman power, as cannibals: "In Cyrene they massacred 220,000 Greeks; in Cyprus 240,000; in Egypt a very great multitude. Many of these unhappy vic-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tims were sawn asunder, according to a precedent to which David had given the sanction of his example. The victorious Jews devoured the flesh, licked up the blood, and twisted the entrails like a girdle round their bodies." (I, 446). Like all those who seek to arouse mankind's hatred against the Jews, Gibbon, speaking with approval of the bloody suppression of the Jews by the Roman enslavers, said the Jews were enemies of mankind: "we are tempted to applaud the severe retaliation which was exercised by the arms of the legions against a race of fanatics whose dire and credulous superstition seemed to render them the implacable enemies not only of the Roman government, but of human kind." *(Ib.)*

In modern days the Jewish "cannibalism" slander has been introduced by Henri Barbusse, a Left bourgeois French writer, highly touted by the Marxists, in his work *Jesus*. A woman character says in the presence of his imaginary Jesus: " 'Mary of Bethezar, the daughter of Eleazar, gave the starving Jewish soldiers her own child to eat.' " (157)

Another English historian well-received in the United States is H. T. Buckle. He writes: "In the same way, because Bossuet had been taught that the Jews are the chosen people of God, he, under the title of Universal History, almost confines his attention to them, and treats this obstinate and ignorant race as if they formed the pivot upon which the affairs of the universe had been made to turn . . . the Jews, stained with every variety of crime, were a plundering and vagabond tribe, wandering on the face of the earth, raising their hand against every man, and every man raising his hand against them." *(Intr. to the History of Civilization in England,* 450)

Imported literary Defamation has ranged from Shakespeare to Conan Doyle. The creator of Sherlock Holmes in a story "The Adventure of Shoscombe Old Place" portrays one of his characters, Sir Robert Norberton, a sportsman, in peril of being robbed by money-lenders. Conan Doyle, instead of confining himself to proper names for these money-lenders, employs the term "Jews." Norbertson's head trainer tells Holmes that Sir Robert's only hope to escape the clutches of the Jews resides in a race horse the Prince: "He thinks of nothing but the horse and the race. His whole life is on it. He's holding off the Jews till then. If the Prince fails him he is done." *(The Complete Sherlock Holmes,* 1301. Garden City Publishing Co. G. C. New York, 1938). Later Sir Robert says to Holmes: "For myself, I am deeply in the hands of the Jews. I have always known that if my sister were to die my creditors would be on to my estate like a flock of vultures." (1310). Conan Doyle has even his beloved hero, Sherlock Holmes, employ Defamation. Speaking to Dr. Watson, Holmes says: "He is mad keen upon winning the Derby. He is in the hands of the Jews." (1306)

The important literary pieces of Defamation are too many to be quoted here in detail. We shall cite something of an unusual sort. When one picks up John Masefield's ballad "London Town" one finds

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in it the verse: "Wretchedly fare the most there, and happily fare the few." Well, what is anti-Semitic about Masefield? The answer is, on the surface nothing. In reality this line is artificial patchwork, because his original words read: "And craftily fares the knave there, and wickedly fares the Jew." Under the protest of the Jewish bourgeoisie, Masefield, poet laureate of England, eliminated the Defamatory line. *(J. D. B.* June 9, 1939). But there is undeleted Defamation elsewhere in Masefield. In *Good Friday* he makes Pilate call the Jews beasts: "I like this Jesus man . . . A God beside these beasts who spit and sting. The best Jew I have known." (23, Macmillan Co. 1916, N. Y.)

Incidentally, as has been shown in these pages, the Jewish bourgeoisie in its frantic but utterly futile attempts to halt the immense sweeping tide of anti-Semitism, succeeds on some rare occasions in preventing temporarily the dissemination of a drop or two of this potent ideological virus. In addition to the examples given elsewhere in this work, here is one more: "Recall Children's Book Because of Anti-Semitism. The publishing firm of Crosset and Dunlap has withdrawn from sale the first printing of a new children's edition of 'Arabian Nights' following protests from organizations and individuals that some of the content was anti-Semitic." *(Jewish Exponent,* Jan. 2, 1948)

The crassest breed of literary Defamers well popularized in the United States is represented by T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound. Eliot, in his "Bleinstein With a Cigar" writes, "The rats are underneath the piles, the Jew is underneath the lot." Eliot was awarded a Nobel Prize. His friend Pound in *Pisan Cantos* writes, "The yidd is a stimulant, and the goyim are cattle in gt/ proportion and go to salable slaughter with the maximum of docility." The implication is, the Jews provoke wars and the Gentiles docilely march off to slaughter. Pound was awarded the Bollingen Prize sponsored by the Library of Congress and endowed by the Mellon billionaires.

In the Spring of 1949 the editors of the Jewish bourgeois magazine *Commentary* questioned a number of Jewish writers about their reactions toward "the continuing presence of the sinister 'Jew' in English literature." No one gave a correct answer, but a recognition of the rise of the Defamation theme in Anglo-American literature and the stress of the "Christian country" idea was noted. Philip Rahv, editor of *Partisan Review,* replied: "Twenty or even ten years ago the problem posed by the editor of *Commentary* might have struck most of us as rather far-fetched, to say the least, if not altogether worked-up in an artificial way by over-wrought Jewish nerves. At this time, however, this problem can no longer be shrugged off. Anti-Semitism is patently on the increase in the literary world; and it is the neo-Christian revival in literature, as Leslie A. Fielder indicates in his recent article, which has given new life and vigor to the Shylock-Fagin image of the Jew." *(Commentary,* Oct. 1949, 361)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The unofficial spirit of hatred toward the Jews is becoming legalized imperceptibly. The New York *Daily News,* probably the most popular bourgeois paper in the United States, with many millions of working class readers, interprets the United States Constitution to mean—"that our Government shall not *officially* discriminate against any religion. It does *not* mean that Americans are forbidden to dislike other Americans on religious or any other grounds. Plenty of people just now are exercising *their right to dislike the Jews.*" (Dec. 16, 1938)

Dislike the Jews! Hate the Jews! To do so is your *Constitutional* right!—thus the subtle legal anti-Semites instruct the masses in a roundabout way. A very "logical" reason for such a corrupting attitude is supplied by H. L. Mencken, an outstanding American bourgeis writer and an open Defamer himself: "The Jews could be put down very plausibly as the most unpleasant race ever heard of." *(Treatise on the Gods)*

The widespread forces of Defamation in the United States are either avowedly anti-Semitic or pretend "neutrality," as does the *Daily News*—"The News is neither anti-Semitic nor pro-Semitic." (Oct. 13, 1945)

During childhood the anti-Semitic "education" is already at an advanced stage. A fairly accurate method of ascertaining the psychology of the Gentile children was used by a Philadelphia institution: "The Philadelphia project employed a special tool to measure child prejudice . . . the project report is swamped with attitudes like these: Viewing the synagogue picture, one child says, 'The Christian children laugh at the Jewish children because they go to synagogue.' Another, when the tester asks what the four non-Jewish children are going to do, replies, 'I think they're going to beat up the Jewish boys because the Catholics don't like the Jewish people . . .' " (H. Whitman, "Is Prejudice Poisoning Our Kids?" *Woman's Home Companion,* Nov. 1949, 33)

In the kindergarten the children are trained through social exercises, games, picture-reading, recitals and similar methods. Defamation is injected into the impressionable mind of a kindergarten tot in various ways, sometimes through nursery rhymes. For example, in *Mother Goose's Melodies* published by McLoughlin Brothers the children are taught a song which trains them to think that the Jews are swindlers and are very greedy for money:

"Jack sold his gold egg
To a rogue of a Jew
Who cheated him out of
The half of his due . . .
The Jew got the goose,
Which he vow'd he would kill,
Resolving at once
His pockets to fill." (33-4)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

10. *Marxism Chiefly Responsible*

We have given a considerable portion of the picture of anti-Semitism in the United States. The blame for the persistence and expansion of anti-Semitism in the United States as elsewhere, must be laid at the door *primarily* of the Marxist scholars who studiously divert the proletarian vanguard from obtaining scientific knowledge of the nature and power of this effective political force in the hands of the enemies of the oppressed. The reason for the deliberate sabotage by the American Marxist "educators" is not limited to their basic need of concealment of the fact that Marx and Engels were anti-Semites. For, as in other lands, there exists in America *Marxist* anti-Semitism.

CHAPTER XIII.

MARXIST ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE UNITED STATES

1. *The Abraham Cahan-McLure's Anti-Semitic Deal*

THE ORIGINAL Marxists in America were German immigrant refugees of 1848. They confined the distribution of Marx's works to German circles in their native language. The first systematic spreading of Marx's writings translated into English was done by the Socialist Labor Party organized in Newark in 1877 led by Daniel De Leon. When Marx's *Class Struggles in France* and other of his political frauds were published in the United States, the American Marxists disseminated them among the advanced workers and Left bourgeois elements and said that when Marx used the term "Jew" he really meant "Capitalism." This was a mutual licence for accepting and spreading Left anti-Semitism, which appeared in the works also of Marx's disciples.

A book avidly read by American Socialist workers was *Merrie England* (1895) by Robert Blatchford, a British Social Democrat. He managed to inject anti-Semitism into the work by giving the following economic example:

"Suppose a rich Jew has lent a million to the government at 3 per cent. He draws every year 30,000 pounds sterling in interest. Who pays it? It is raised by taxation. Who pays the taxes? They are all paid either by the workers or by those who get their money from the workers. And the Jew gets his interest forever." (56)

Two million copies of *Merrie England* were distributed by the British Socialists in England; a million copies were distributed by the American Socialists in the United States.

The largest publisher of Marxist works in America prior to the formation of the Communist Party was a Socialist cooperative enter-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

prise, Charles H. Kerr and Company. In 1906 it put out a book *The Positive Outcome of Philosophy,* by Joseph Dietzgen whom Marx had introduced to the International with the words "this is our philosopher." Dietzgen contemptuously linked evil spirits with the Polish Jews: "Creatures of fiction and real creatures are not so radically different that they would not all of them fit into the general gender of being. The manner, the form of being, are different. Goblins exist in fiction and Polish Jews exist in a tangible form, but they both exist. The general existence comprises the body and soul, fiction and truth, goblins and Polish Jews." (365)

As in Europe, Marxism in the United States from the outset has been functioning as a Left auxiliary to the bourgeois Defamers. It followed the fixed pattern of relegating anti-Semitism entirely to the background. The Dreyfus frame-up was practically ignored by American Marxism, or, in the case of a Jewish Socialist Philipp Kranz of the New York *Abendblatt,* opposition was expressed against the Dreyfus partisans. Although all leading American Marxists were qualified as Left supporters of anti-Semitism, it was the Jewish Marxists, who, logically, could be least suspected and who, therefore, were most effective. One of the best examples is the case of Abraham Cahan. He rendered direct assistance to a Defamer B. J. Hendrick a little more than a year before the War of 1914. First, we give an exposition of Hendrick's central theme—that the Jews were becoming the masters of the United States—an American version of Drumont's theme in *Jewish France.* Back in February 1900 a Liberal magazine *The Bookman* carried an article by Hendrick with a fairly obvious title "The Great Jewish Invasion." The author painted a picture of a Jewish immigrant horde conquering the United States, with the economy already under Jewish control: "In Wall Street, business is largely in Jewish hands." (309). Thirteen years later Hendrick, in a similar article, gave the impression that there was hardly any economic or social area in the United States free from Jewish domination. "The great Jewish manufacturers of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore and a few other American cities monopolize the clothing of more than 90,000,000 Americans." ("The Jewish Invasion of America," *McClure's,* March 1913, 134). "The Jews are rapidly acquiring a monopoly of the land." (136). Hendrick reserved his most poisoned arrows for the Jewish immigrants from Russia. "Protestant and Catholic children now taught by Jewesses . . . In Russia these Jewesses would not be permitted to enter a school as pupils; here the primary education of even Protestant and Catholic children is largely in their hands." (143)

In this article Hendrick by inuendos intimated that the Jews were succeeding in conquering America because they were innately dishonest and greedy. He merely posed a thesis here and *McClure's* was to have a follow-up article containing the proof. The task of substantiating this thesis was assigned to an eminent Jewish leader

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of American Marxism, an immigrant from Russia himself. Hendrick recommended him to the readers: "The writer has contented himself chiefly with recording facts, and has only incidentally touched upon the racial traits and training that have made possible this success. In succeeding articles in this magazine, a well-known writer, himself a distinguished Jew, Mr. Abraham Cahan, editor of the *Vorwarts*, a Jewish daily with a large circulation on the New York East Side, will analyze this phase of the subject. Mr. Cahan will show, by concrete example, the minute workings of that wonderful machine, the Jewish brain. His articles will make clear why it is that the Jews so easily surpass or crowd out, at least in business and finance, the other great immigrating races,—Irish, Germans, Scandinavians and Italians—and why, in the next hundred years, the Semitic influence is likely to be almost prepondering in the United States." (165)

Cahan had obviously agreed to play along with Hendrick. It is plain, too, that coming from an immigrant East European Jew and a Marxist writer to boot, a "substantiation" of the charge that the Russian Jews were securing advantages in the American business world through cunning, trickery and what was generally described as "unfair business practices" would benefit the Defamers in many ways. It was bound to have infinitely more weight than if furnished by a Gentile. It would serve as an explanation for the growing anti-Jewish sentiment in America and, best of all, would be accepted even by the Jewish masses. Moreover, it would facilitate the spread of anti-Semitism, especially of the Hendrick type.

Had Cahan submitted a document dealing with the rise of the capitalist class in America, unfolding a panorama of the Gentile aristocrats and merchants setting up a system of slavery and colossal land robbery, the cheating of naive Indians, the nightmare of corruption and dishonesty and murder that went with the expansion of the Frontier; had he transported his reader back to the era of the robber railroad builders and their land grabs, reviewed the swindles of the Gentile bankers who cheated even the United States Government by selling faulty rifles to the Army; had he traced the original sources of the riches of the Duponts, Astors, Vanderbilts, Morgans, Rockefellers, and other Gentile houses of fabulous wealth, and shown that the basic industry of the United States—railroads, coal, oil, cotton, meat-packing, steel, timber, tobacco, automobile, food, electric, fisheries, and other fundamental branches of economy—was almost exclusively in the hands of the Gentile bourgeoisie, while the Jewish capitalists were primarily in the needle and retail trades, this would have been an attempt at a presentation of an accurate picture of the minute share of grabbing and swindling that fell to the Jewish bourgeoisie. If Abraham Cahan had at least explained that the Jews in East European countries, due to the calculated policy of economic, social and government pressure, were forced into peddling and tailoring as the chief means of earning a livelihood and that in con-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sequence it was these accustomed fields which they in greater degree than in other fields almost automatically entered in the United States, with many of them becoming clothing manufacturers and merchants, he would have given to that extent a true story of "the Jewish capitalist system" in America. But any such over-all presentation would not have been in conformity with Hendrick's aim, nor with the policy the publishers of *McClure's* adopted toward anti-Semitism And so Abraham Cahan, the publisher of the Jewish-Marxist newspaper in America, dipped his pen into the Defamation slop-pail and went to work. He fashioned a short story entitled "The Autobiography of an American Jew." In it he presented a fictional character, a Jewish emigrant from Russia, who through various unsavory ways became a rich clothing manufacturer in New York. Writing in the first person Cahan gave the details desired of him by Hendrick: "Also, I tried to pick up table manners and other forms of refined behavior. All this, I felt, was an essential element in achieving business success . . . This, however, did not keep me from resorting to certain practices which I knew to harmonize with anything but one's sense of gentlemanly conduct. For example, one day, when I had some bills to meet two days before I could expect to obtain the cash, I had recourse to the following subterfuge: I made out and signed the checks in proper order, but enclosed each of them in the wrong envelope—this supposed act of inadvertence gaining me the needed two days of grace. On another occasion I sent out a number of checks without any signature, which I had presumably forgotten to afix." (Abraham Cahan, "The Autobiography of an American Jew," *McClure's*, June 1913, 141)

Thus the Jewish Marxist, Cahan, "substantiated" the age-long Defamation charge that the Jews resorted to dirty, deceitful tricks in money matters. By implication these tricks were *Jewish* since Cahan did not give even a hint that non-Jews might have also employed such practices.

Writing with seeming authority on the subject Cahan illustrated how a virtually pennyless Jewish immigrant, spreading corruption among workers and resorting to despicable petty brigandage, became a successful clothing manufacturer: "It is an open secret in our trade that fashions put out by one firm are often pirated by smaller houses before the new cloak or jacket is put on the market. Some tailor employed in the large factory will copy the new sample and sell the design for a few dollars to some of the manufacturer's competitors. In this manner it was not difficult for me to copy Chaikin's samples . . ." (146-7). Cahan came close to copying some features from the picture of a "Jewish" business man drawn by Fourier. Cahan's "Iscariot" played a cat-and-mouse game with customers and underpayed workers: "I would sell at cost price rather than lose a customer. 'Get hold of him,' my instinct would whisper to me. 'Later on he'll pay you with interest.' The pleasure of expanding, of building up my business, was

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

profit enough for me. But my greatest strength in minimizing the cost of production lay in the peculiar knack I had developed for unearthing the cheapest labor obtainable." (147)

After publishing his short story Cahan decided to use it as a basis for a larger work. Thus his novel *The Rise of David Levinsky,* famous in its day (1917), cropped up, an outcome of an anti-Semitic deal in 1913.

It would be well to divert a moment to show that while Cahan was shaping up his novel, Defamation was advancing much along the Hendrick-Cahan lines. A fairly good example is an article *"The Conquest of America"* by H. Scheffauer in *Contemporary Review,* London, January-June 1914. He wrote in part: "It must in justice be remarked that the resentment of refined Americans at the social aggressions of the rich and vulgar Hebrew is not without its reasonable basis . . . Power! power! that is the loudest cry of the disinherited tribes of Israel in that new world beyond the sea, and power there means at present little more than the force that lies in money . . . Everywhere resound the religious chants and invocations meant for the ear of Jehova—still worshipped as of old. But the new generations have their new gods in the New Land, and of these Mammon the mightiest of all." (252-253)

In *The Rise of David Levinsky,* Cahan supplied new pointers to the bourgeois anti-Semites and in somewhat revamped phrases repeated the old ones as: "The practice of pirating designs was rapidly becoming an open secret, in fact." (345). It was a case-history of a Jewish bourgeois exactly as portrayed by the Shmakovs, Lutostanskys, Drumonts and other professional Defamers. "David Levinsky" was without a conscience, was a worshipper of money, a liar and a cheat, an atheist hypocritically frequenting the synagogue, and had the "ability to undersell the old-established houses." (341). Just as with Fourier's "Judas Iscariot," deception and thievery were the chief traits of Cahan's "Jewish immigrant" from Russia: "About a month later I came across Loeb on Broadway, New York. 'By the way,' he said, in the course of our brief talk, with a twinkle in his eye, 'did you sell anything to Huntington?' 'Huntington? St. Louis? Why, he really is a hard man to reach,' I answered glumly. At that very moment my cutters were at work on a big order from Huntington, largely for copies from Loeb's styles." (338-9)

The Defamation features in Cahan's book were heavily masked with commonplace incidents, with touches of romance and with many other decorative features of a novel. The bourgeois scholars highly recommended his anti-Semitic painting of "Jewish life" in the United States: "A notable picture of Jewish life in America is Abraham Cahan's *The Rise of David Levinsky.*" (R. Spiller, W. Thorp, T. Johnson, H. Canby, editors, *Literary History of the United States,* 300-301)

It is in place to point out that it was Abraham Cahan who at the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Brussels Congress of the Second International (Aug. 1891) asked to condemn anti-Semitism. But those were his young and "foolish" days. Since then he had learned to cover up the anti-Semitic virus within Marxism and to prostitute his own talents to the Defamers.

For many decades Cahan was adored by virtually all the Jewish Marxist workers. He was described by a Jewish fraternal Marxist publication as follows: "renowned founder and editor of the Forward, Abe Cahan, a Titan among journalists and among Socialist leaders of the past half century." *(The Workmen Circle Call,* July 1947, 5). And what of the anti-Semitic novel, the larger result of Cahan's deal with the Defamers? "*The Rise of David Levinsky* has been acclaimed by critics and readers as an outstanding novel depicting Jewish immigrant life in America." *(Ib.* Jan. 1942, 14)

2. *Marxist Anti-Semitism in the United States After the Bolshevik Revolution—The Socialist Party*

Although anti-Semitism within the Social-Democratic wing of American Marxism, both in the Jewish and non-Jewish sectors, was on the whole well hidden, it came into the open at the Socialist Party Convention held in Milwaukee in 1932. When the eruption occurred the "conciliators" at the Convention exerted their energy to conceal the anti-Semitism in the Socialist Party. Heywood Broun, who in *Christians Only* made an attempt to expose anti-Semitism within Christian circles, fervently sought to cover up the same virus inside the Socialist Party, while Abraham Cahan's manager of the *Forward* gave organizational support to the undisguised Socialist anti-Semites on the pretext of "Party Unity!"

"Milwaukee—May 25—An outburst of anti-Semitism at the Socialist Party's national convention here, though promptly suppressed, still left bitter feeling as the convention concluded its session last night . . .

"Hillquit, in accepting the nomination as chairman, referred to the fact that he was a Jew and challenged his opponents to say directly they objected to him on that ground. 'I made the unfortunate choice,' he said, satirically, 'of being born in an un-American country of Jewish parents.'

"Joseph Sharts, of Dayton, Ohio, supporting Hillquit, declared: "One senses in the arguments here that a man must have 100 per cent American background and that if one be a Jew of foreign birth he reads himself out of the party.'

" 'There is no such issue here,' B. C. Vladeck, manager of the "Jewish Daily Forward," declared. He seconded Hoan's nomination, however, as a matter of party unity, he said, and to 'recognize the practical work of the Milwaukee Socialists.' " *(J. D. B.* May 26, 1932)

"Mr. Thomas and Heywood Broun, one of his lieutenants, denied vehemently that the race issue had played any part in the fight. Mr.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Hillquit and his supporters, however, charged directly that a whispering campaign, emphasizing the fact that Mr. Hillquit was a Jew and that the party should be rid of foreign elements, had been carried on throughout the country for the past three months . . .

" 'Comrade Heywood Broun, to whom socialism is such a delightful novelty, has discovered that there is no racial discrimination in the Socialist platform,' Mr. Hillquit continued. 'I am here to charge that efforts have been made to introduce the issue and not on this floor alone.'

". . . Mr. Hillquit said he 'apologized' for having been born abroad, being a Jew and living in New York, 'A very unpopular place.' " *(N. Y. T.,* May 24, 1932)

3. *The Communist Party's anti-Semitism*

When Hillquit's victory was announced, the *Daily Worker* printed a cartoon (May 25, 1932) in which the Socialist Party was depicted as a prostitute offering herself to a Wall Street imperialist. The striking aspect in the cartoon was the prostitute's face—*Hillquit's features* with a monstrous "Jewish nose"!

In the era of the Comintern it was not the Socialists but the Stalin burocrats who became the chief promoters of Marxist anti-Semitism in the United States. Shielded by the prevailing delusion that Marx fought for the liberation of the oppressed, Jews included, the American Stalinists boldly published in English his anti-Semitic work *On the Jewish Question.* Their audacity went to the point of attacking the tendency which sought to eliminate Marx's slanderous anti-Jewish remarks in translation of his works. Thus, Marx, in criticizing Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity,* used a phrase "dirty-Jewish form." When a shame-faced Marxist changed the phrase in translation to "disgusting form," the more consistent Marxist Stalin burocracy was furious with him. It instructed L. Rudas, one of its penhacks, to attack the translator as a distorter of Marxism. Before taking care of the translator, Rudas cited the exact words Marx used in criticizing Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity:*

" 'Consequently, in the *Essence of Christianity,* he regards the theoretical attitude as the only genuinely human attitude, while practice is conceived and fixed only in its *dirty-Jewish* form of appearance.' (My italics—L. R.)

"Our worthy 'translator,' who as we have seen endeavours to reconcile religion and the proletarian movement, is 'shocked' at the manner in which Marx expresses himself and in order not to give offense to the Jews he *simply omits* the word 'Jew' which results in the following version:

" 'He, therefore, in the *Wessen des Christentums* regards only theoretical activity as generally human (?-L. R.), while the 'praxis'

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

is conceived and fixed only in its *disgusting form.*'" (L. Rudas, Preface to *Ludwig Feuerbach* by Engels. Int. Publishers, XV, 12-13)

Paradoxically, the Stalin burocracy was correct in declaring that the "translator" distorted Marx by omitting the anti-Semitic term.

It has been customary for the Stalin burocrats to employ subtlety in their Defamation. For example, in the Autumn of 1929 the Jewish Stalin paper *Freiheit* of New York supplemented its fight against the Zionists with a series of "Jewish nose" cartoons (Sept. 4, Sept. 19, Oct. 3, 1929). Sometimes the Stalin burocrats would merely apply the "Jewish name" technique so in vogue among the bourgeois Defamers. A Stalin literary magazine, in attacking a fugitive Red Army general known as Krivitsky, denoted their contempt for him, their anti-Semitism and their Russian Marxist patriotism by indicating that Krivitsky was an "Austrian" and a *Jew:* " 'General Krivitsky,' you are Shmelka Ginsberg . . . Your middle initial G. stands for Ginsberg." *(New Masses,* May 9, 1939). "Ginsberg-Krivitsky" *(Ib.* Oct. 29, 1939). It is interesting that, to our knowledge, the Stalin burocrats had never "exposed" Krivitsky's Jewish identity before, nor had he himself.

Quite an embarrassing situation for the American Stalin burocrats was created by the sensational unmasking of Theodore Dreiser, a Left bourgeois writer, for a long time a Comintern fellow-traveller, and after his unmasking, a respectable member of the Stalin Party.

In 1933 Dreiser in correspondence with Hapgood, a Left Liberal or perhaps a Right Marxist, expressed himself in precise anti-Semitic words manifesting strong detestation for the Jews. Hapgood kept the Dreiser letters private from October 1933 to April 1935. Then for some unclear reason he made them public. In one of the letters Dreiser wrote: "If you listen to Jews discussing Jews, you will find that they are money-minded, very pagan, very sharp in practice, and, usually, so far as the rest is concerned, they have the single objective of plenty of money by means of which they build a fairly material surrounding . . . The Jews lack, if I read the Pennsylvania Bar Association correctly, the fine integrity which at least is endorsed and, to a degree, followed by the lawyers of other nationalities. Left to sheer liberalism as you interpret it, they could possess America by sheer numbers, their cohesion, and their race tastes, and, as in the case of the Negro in South Africa, really overrun the land." *(The Nation,* April 17, 1935)

The disclosure of Dreiser's private anti-Semitism, especially at the time of the rising Nazi persecution of the Jews, caused a sensation. There was disgust and indignation among the radical Jewish and non-Jewish workers. They sensed that they had been deceived by their leaders into believing that Dreiser, who obviously was a secret Nazi sympathizer, was innately pure. Among the Stalin burocrats, who for years had been paying glowing tribute to Dreiser as a fighter for emancipation of all the oppressed, the disclosure produced consternation. They tried to provide an out for Dreiser and themselves, a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

common preoccupation with them in such cases. A delegation was sent to "interview" Dreiser. It was headed for psychological purposes by Jewish burocrats, Michael Gold and Joshua Kunitz. Disregarding Dreiser's frank language the Delegation sought to induce him to issue a public statement behind which they could all take refuge. Dreiser refused. A second "interview" followed. This time he was persuaded to see that the differences between him and Marxism on the question were more apparent than real. Importuned by the burocrats he finally issued an "explanation" which was more misleading than clarifying. The Stalin burocrats twisted it around, gave it a positive meaning and pretended to be more or less satisfied. Having printed his statement they wrote among other things, "We decline to believe that it will be impossible for Theodore Dreiser to regain the traditional place as a fighter for human liberty." *(New Masses,* April 30, 1935, 11)

Again we see that Marxism, when occasion demands, exercises peculiarly perverted reasoning. Everybody who followed the rules of logic recognized that Dreiser prior to the Hapgood exposure had been a masked anti-Semite, but the Stalin burocrats pretended to believe that he had become one only on the day his true face was revealed.

Dreiser of course realized that if he were to admit that his feeling regarding the Jews was in line with the anti-Semitic propaganda of the Nazis, his "revolutionary" reputation and his position as one of the respected Left-bourgeois writers in America would have been ruined. The Stalin burocrats appreciated his difficulty and through their Jewish colleague, Michael Gold, helped him to continue parading in the anti-Nazi garb. In an article "The Gun is Loaded, Dreiser!" purporting to warn Dreiser against continuing being an anti-Semite, Gold said: "Dreiser denies he is with the Nazis, and we believe him." *(Ib.* May 7, 1935). And then Gold invited Dreiser to reenter the fold: "Theodore Dreiser has damaged his own great name and the cause of the oppressed by his carelessly spoken words. It is my belief he can now undo this damage only by years of devoted battle against anti-Semitism and fascism." *(Ib.).* As many other anti-Semites before him, Dreiser was eventually accepted into the membership of the Comintern.

In his public writings Dreiser was extremely careful. He disseminated the anti-Semitic virus by means of the "Jewish name" technique. Thus, in his novel *An American Tragedy* Dreiser pictures a poor Gentile girl admiring a coat in a shop window. The proprietor of the shop who makes up his mind to swindle her is a Jew, but Dreiser indicates this only by giving him a Jewish name. "She clapped her hands admiringly, while Isadore Rubenstein, the elderly son of the proprietor, who was standing somewhat out of range of her gaze at the moment, noted the gesture and her enthusiasm and decided forthwith that the coat must be worth at least twenty-five or fifty dollars more to her, anyhow, in case she inquired for it. The firm had been offering it at one hundred . . . What, say, would the poverty

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and vanity of such a pretty girl as this cause her to yield for such a coat?" (I, 103)

When Dreser died, the Bolshevik State was enveloped in an atmosphere of mourning: "It was with deep sorrow that Soviet intellectuals and the Soviet reading public learned of Theodore Dreiser's death . . . The Soviet people were aware that in Dreiser they had an earnest and high-principled friend . . . On the occasion of his death commemorative meetings and lectures were held in Moscow, Leningrad and other Soviet cities . . . The State Publishing House is to issue a new edition of his collected works." *(New Masses,* Jan. 29, 1946)

Irving Howe, an American Left bourgeois writer, commented on Dreiser: "Dreiser has the reputation of having liberated American writing from gentility and of having fathered the American naturalistic social novel. In his last years he considered himself a radical and at the time of his death was a member of the Communist Party. Yet he was also an anti-Semite; and though I knew of his anti-Semitism in general, I still found myself pained and shocked by his advice to a friend that only Americans, and not Jews, should be trusted in business. Why, one wonders, in all the tributes paid Dreiser, has this vicious, not exactly secret, streak of prejudice so seldom been mentioned? And why do not those present-day novelists who hail him as the liberator of American fiction consider how his anti-Semitism may affect the role they assign to him?" *(Commentary,* Oct. 1949, 364)

Another American Left bourgeois writer covered up Dreiser with these rapturous terms: "Dreiser—despite a lack of political clarity which led him to defend Stalin's regime and the Moscow trials—served as one of the most powerful liberating forces in twentieth-century American literature and social thinking." (J. T. Farrell, *Literature and Morality,* 26)

CHAPTER XIV.

MARX UPHOLDING NEGRO SLAVERY: THE POLITICAL DISTINCTION BETWEEN NEGRO AND JEW

1. *Anti-Negroism and Anti-Semitism Compared*

WHEN WE STUDY Marxist writings we are struck by the fact that although they often deal with the Negro Question alone they hardly ever treat the question of anti-Semitism separately but usually confuse it with the case of the Negroes. Another point which strikes us is that they give much greater attention to the latter. Why do they put more stress on the Negro Question? A perusal of the history of the Jews and that of the Negroes will disclose that by comparison the institution of the Jewish Scapegoat has played an immeasurably greater role in the life of the four social systems—Ancient chattel

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

slave, Feudal, Capitalist and Marxist—than the Negro. The Defamation, oppression, torture and mass slaughter of the Jews has been more vicious and widespread and in numbers of victims and in the length of time beyond comparison with the case of the Negro or of any other persecuted group. As a Negro leader told L. Wedlock: " 'Jewish history has shown that the Negro situation has been but child's play.' " *(The Howard University Studies in the Social Sciences,* III, #2, 140)

Compared with the institution of the Jewish Scapegoat, the Negro Question is of recent origin and is limited geographically. The spirit of bourgeois as well as of Marxist society is preponderantly anti-Jewish, but not anti-Negro. Europe and the Orient are virtually free from any race prejudice against the Negro, while in Africa and America where the Negro Question exists, the Negro is not persecuted as a historical scapegoat but is kept down in the tradition of slavery. He is marked off from the ruling Gentile bourgeoisie by the color of his skin, not by a twenty-five-centuries' old system of vicious Defamation and appalling massacres. He is not accused of the mythical murder of the invented "Savior" or of drinking the blood of Christian children. While the Jew is artificially painted as a grasping, rapacious, with a highly developed, yet criminal intellect, cruel and vindictive enemy of all mankind, the Negro is artificially painted with an opposite false color. "Mentally the Negro is inferior to the white." *(Enc. Brit.* XIX, 344). No one is accusing the Negro of a diabolical plot to seize control of the world. His religion is not "money," as Marx said about the religion of the Jews, but the respected Christian faith "bestowed" upon him by the ruling Gentiles themselves. He has never been threatened with total extermination. And even during the Civil War the slave-owning aristocracy did not attempt to frame him as a scapegoat by blaming Confederate defeats on alleged Negro spying or treachery. There is a vast political difference between anti-Jewish pogroms and the lynching of Negroes. The pogrom is a mass slaughter of the Jewish population not as a punishment for an alleged crime but on the basis of Defamation. Lynch law is applied almost exclusively to individual Negroes for alleged offenses "Without due process of law"; but politically lynch law serves the Gentile ruling element as a terroristic reminder to the Negro that his status is extralegal, that he must stay "in his place." The general unwritten law is to keep the Negro from occupying executive posts where he would stand in a commanding position over White workers. Otherwise the feeling of the Gentile capitalists and workers towards the Negro is not that of hatred but of racial "superiority." The Negro capitalist, lawyer or doctor is no particular competitor to the Gentile, nor is the Negro proletarian, who is generally and deliberately forced by the White masters to be confined to the meanest manual work and who, because of the color of his skin, is unable to make use of any "Marrano" methods. In literature, art and film there is little vilification of the Negro character; rather there is a well-disposed, patronizing air. And here too he is

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

always kept "in his place." His servant position in society is emphasized. He is a valet, a waiter, a bootblack, a railroad porter, a cook, a buffoon or at best a baseball player, a jazz-musician or a blues singer. In contrast, the Jewish characters in the theatre or motion pictures are either drawn with openly anti-Semitic implications or are surrounded with a pretense at combatting anti-Semitism; the Scapegoat role of the Jews is always completely obscured.

The Marxists avoid analyzing or even taking sufficient notice of the relatively new phenomena, the spread of anti-Semitism among the Negroes and the rise of anti-Negro sentiments among the Jews. It was not the Marxists but the Negro and Jewish Liberals who finally came around to the admission of the phenomena: "Worst of all, we must admit that there is anti-Negroism among Jews and anti-Semitism among Negroes. This truth is awful and we may hate to confess it, but nothing at all can be done to stamp out these growths, if we ostrich-like bury our heads in the sands of silence." (L. D. Reddick, *The Negro Quarterly,* Summer 1942, 113). "A new phenomenon confronts the Jewish Community of America. Anti-Semitism among Negroes on a large scale is witnessed in cities having the largest colored populations—Chicago, New York, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, and other cities of major rank." ("The Negro-Jewish Problem" Anti-Defamation League of B'nai Brith, *The A. D. L. Review,* Jan. 1942, 10)

But, often, though people are able to take cognizance of certain social phenomena they do not make a correct analysis of them. A simplified explanation of Negro anti-Semitism reads: "The Negro's hostility toward Jews is part of his general hostility toward all Whites." (S. Bellow, *Contemporary Jewish Record,* Feb. 1944, 93). Actually the Negro's hostility to the Jews is of entirely different variety from his feelings toward the Gentiles. It is of the same character as the anti-Jewish sentiment of the average ignorant Christian White. Hostility toward the Jews was implanted in the Negro when he was brought from Africa, impressed into slavery, and was told the Christian fable that many centuries ago a "Savior" appeared in the world and was crucified by the Jews. The Negro preachers brought the mythical tragedy closer to the Negro's heart by painting the "Savior" black-skinned. That the Negro makes a definite distinction between the Gentile "White folks" and "the Jews" is concretely demonstrated by a small anti-Jewish pogrom in Detroit in 1943: "The sacking and looting of Jewish-owned and operated stores in the Negro section (of Detroit) has led many observers to speculate on the extent and depth of anti-Semitism among Detroit Negroes. The fact that a few white owned non-Jewish stores and many establishments owned by Negroes were left unmolested gave some credence to the theory that the riot had pronounced anti-Semitic manifestations." (L. Martin, *New Currents,* August 1943; cited by N. Zuckerman in *The Wine of Violence,* 323)

The efforts to divert the Negro from struggle against all oppres-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sors is exemplified by demagogic stories that Whites and Negroes are both fellow-sufferers under the Jewish capitalist enslavement: "May we remind the American public that there are millions of WHITE men in our country, who fare no better than the Negroes. The majority of colored people are quite satisfied with the treatment WHITE men give them. However, their distress is due to the oppression of the JEWISH economic system, which is the source of all the troubles." *(American Bulletin,* Apr. 8, 1935). Alongside of this thesis, propaganda goes on, spread also by Left anti-Semites. Thus, the famous Fabian Socialist, H. G. Wells, seeks to incite the Negro against the "preying" and "acquisitive" Jews: ". . . now a wretched little gain here and now a wretched little gain there, that make the dirty fortune of the Russian Jews who prey upon color in the Carolinas." *(The Future in America,* 191). "The colored people of America are of a different quality from the Jew altogether, more genial, more careless, more sympathetic, franker, less intellectual, less acquisitive, less wary and restrained." (199)

Anti-Negroism among the Jews is of two kinds. The first is that of the early American Jews of the "elite" Sephardim who arrived in the era when the Negro was a chattel slave, the property of any White who was rich enough to own him. Under the circumstances it was but natural for the Jews to look upon the Negro with White "superiority." In the South after the Civil War the Jews followed the code of local behavior. They loyally adhered to the Jim Crow laws and were generally silent about lynchings. The second type of anti-Negroism among Jews is different in origin and character. Its cause is the critical international situation and the organized campaigns against the Jews. It is an unconscious—and with some Jews perhaps a deliberate—bid to the Gentile ruling sectors to shift the role of Scapegoat upon the Negro.

In the face of increasing anti-Jewish pressure, reports tell about "Jews who objected to a poster against discrimination because it mentioned Jews and Negroes together." (M. Rukeyser, *Contemporary Jewish Record,* Feb. 1944, 8). Such Jews want to be together with the Gentile bourgeoisie not with the Negro. An interesting case occurred during Henry Ford's anti-Semitic drive: "Jewish children segregated with Negroes in Michigan schools. Mr. Mordecai Katz, writing in the *Jewish Daily News,* commends the National Council of Jewish Women for its decision to protest against the action of the authorities at Canton Harbor, Michigan, in segregating the Jewish school children in separate classes together with the Negroes." *(J. D. B.* Nov. 26, 1924)

The Jewish bourgeoisie has maintained rigid loyalty to local or regional Gentile bourgeois traditions and policies. This has led to a sharp conflict within Jewish bourgeois organizations even to a point of a threatening split: "Southern lodges may secede from the B'nai B'rith as a result of a bitter squabble over the Jim Crow issue at the triennial national convention of the Jewish organization in session here, it was learned tonight . . . the issue has been complicated by

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

charges that B'nai B'rith follows a policy of appeasement and hush-hush treatment of anti-Semitism at high levels . . . In the Deep South, some B'nai B'rith members are describing themselves as 'Southerners of Mosaic persuasion,' rather than 'Jews.' It is these elements which claim that they themselves are living satisfactorily in their environment and that they do not like to be embarrassed by all this stuff about tolerance. It is all right to discuss prejudice in the North, they say, but keep quiet about it in the South." *(Daily Compass,* March 20, 1950)

Some Negro leaders imagine that the tendency on the part of certain Jewish circles to have the Negro take the place of the Jewish Scapegoat in being crowned with success: "The Negro, in short, is the scapegoat that is saving the American Jew." *(Pittsburgh Courier,* Nov. 15, 1941)

In the immediate situation the Negro is artificially placed by the ruling Gentile bourgeoisie at the lowest social level of society. In relation to the Negro bourgeoisie the Jewish bourgeoisie represents momentarily a section of the White master class, and the Jewish proletariat, also in a temporary, not in a historical, sense, represents in relation to the Negro proletariat and Negro share-croppers a section of the White American aristocracy of labor. The Negro, especially in the South, is a servant to all White social groups, Jews included. The Negro status is that of an outcast who is excluded from the social life of the White population by the Jim Crow laws. The Jew, who is automatically included in the White sector, is therefore in a position of material, social and racial supremacy in relation to the Negro; the Jew—capitalist and a highly paid worker—in the immediate situation in the South is among the White exploiters of the Negro. And yet in the *historical* sense, the Jew is branded as no other racial or social group has ever been in all the existence of human society; he is stigmatized with a specially invented Defamation; he is *the* traditional, classical Scapegoat of the Christian world. This is the basic distinction between the Jew and the Negro. A vivid idea of the *historical* difference between the true status of the Negro and the Jew in the Christian world can be gathered in the following way. There was in 1943 an estimated 150,000,000 Negro population on the globe. What would have been the understanding of a political student regarding the status of the Negro as a social group if within a single generation over one-third—about *sixty million Negroes*—were massacred as a Scapegoat! And that is the proportion of the Jewish group murdered in the Lenin and the Hitler periods. The Jew is used by the oppressors to divert mass discontent; the Negro never!

The Marxists ignore the dangerous developments within the two groups: among the Jews the tendency to induce the ruling Gentile bourgeoisie to shift the historical role of the Jew to the Negro; among the Negroes the hostility towards the Jews aimed by the Defamers to use the Negroes as part of the general pogromist force. The little

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Detroit "pogrom" is a significant sign in what direction anti-Semitism is misguiding the Negro. The Marxists prefer to leave the Negro anti-Semitism and the anti-Negro corruption among the Jews untouched by scientific study and analysis. Their interest in the Negro is limited to the general problem of making the appearance of a liberating force before all the oppressed and exploited. Through the demagogic outcries against the segregation and the hounding of the Negro, the Marxists create the false impression that they are the true champions for Negro liberty and thus gain for themselves another important "progressive" mask. Meantime the Stalin Marxists have been for years advocating a Negro republic, a "revolutionary" form of Negro segregation in the so-called "black belt" of the South; the Social Democratic Marxists collaborate with the Negro bourgeoisie which is fawning upon the ruling Gentile capitalists; the Trotsky Marxists give "critical" support to the Stalin, Social democratic and Negro bourgeois reaction. That the Marxists' clamor against the Jim Crow segregation and the lynching of the Negro is demagogy is seen, among other signs, from their role in the Scottsborough Case. When the affair was new and could serve their purpose they trumpeted their "defense" of the Scottsborough Boys all over the world. But when it ceased to be a "live" issue they dropped it quietly, abandoning the Negro victims to a living death behind bars.

With regard to the Marxist attitude towards the two proscribed groups, the Negroes and the Jews, it is not only the pursuit of establishing a strong influence among the Negroes that prompts the Marxists to lay a disproportionately greater stress on the Negro Question than on the problem of anti-Semitism. There is a deep reason for this policy—the same reason which compelled the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks to violate their pledges to enlighten the masses on the problem of anti-Semitism; that prompted Lenin in 1905 to divert the mind of the Russian proletariat to the local Tartar-Armenian situation in the Caucasus from the far more serious political feature, the Tsar's chief tactic against the Revolution, the anti-Jewish pogroms; the same reason that impelled the leaders of the First, Second, Third and Fourth International to ignore or play down at their Congresses the world-political problem of anti-Semitism, thus aid the exploiters and oppressors to resort periodically to the use of the Scapegoat as a powerful means of diverting the workers from the path of struggle for the liberation of the proletariat and of all the enslaved and persecuted races and social groups.

2. *The Distinction Between Marx's Crime Against the Jews and His Crime Against the Negroes*

If Lenin felt safe in the Tartar-Armenian situation to overshadow the vital importance of anti-Semitism, Lenin's American followers have been confident that they could make use of the Negro Question to push the problem of anti-Semitism into the background. Knowing,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

as everybody does who has read Marx's works and whose mind has escaped the Marxist quicksand, that Marx was an anti-Semite, they have been covering it up by utilizing the general delusion that Marx held a progressive position on the Negro Question. No one has ever questioned this belief, whereas many people, Jewish and Gentile, Liberals and professional Defamers, have pointed out Marx's anti-Semitism. Whether the top Marxist "educators" have been ignorant of Marx's actual position on the Negroes or knowingly have been hiding it is difficult to ascertain. Thus far we have shown only that they misrepresented his line on the Mexican War, a position which, indirectly, involved the question of chattel slavery. Marx's position of support to the Mexican War was not accidental. It was one of the numerous case histories which expose his political system—in this instance his stand on the question of Negro slavery. In 1861 Marx and Engels wrote in connection with the Civil War in the United States "but continual expansion of territory and continual extension of slavery beyond their old limits is a law of life for the slave states of the Union." *(Die Presse,* Oct. 25, 1861; Marx and Engels *The Civil War in the United States,* 66-7)

It is clear that the Mexican War thirteen years earlier had been a concretization of this law. Was this law known during the Mexican War? We read in the same work by Marx and Engels: "John Calhoun, whom the slaveholders admire as their statesman par excellence, stated as early as February 19, 1847, in the Senate, that the Senate alone put a balance of power into the hands of the South, that extension of the slave territory was necessary to preserve this equilibrium between South and North in the Senate, and that the attempts of the South at the creation of new slave states by force were accordingly justified." (68). One of the means of achieving this policy was "through conquest of foreign lands." *(Ib.)*

Marx's support to the Mexican War poses the question squarely: Was Marx a conscious or merely an objective supporter of Negro slavery and of its extension? In 1846-7 Marx wrote *La Misere de la Philosophie* a polemic against Proudhon's *Philosophie de la Misere.* Criticizing Proudhon's sentimental approach to Negro slavery, Marx wrote:

"Direct slavery is the pivot of bourgeois industry as well as machinery, credit, etc. Without slavery you have no cotton, without cotton you cannot have modern industry . . . Without slavery, North America, the most progressive country, would have been transformed into a patriarchal country. Efface North America from the map of the world and you would have the anarchy, the complete decadence, of modern commerce and civilization. Cause slavery to disappear, and you will have effaced America from the map of nations.

"Thus slavery, because it is an economic category, has always existed in the institutions of the nations. Modern nations have known

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

how to disguise slavery in their own lands alone, they have imposed it without disguise on the New World.

"What will M. Proudhon do to save slavery? He puts the problem: Conserve the good side of this economic category, eliminate the bad.

"Hegel has no problems to put. He has only dialectic. M. Proudhon has of the dialectic of Hegel nothing but the language. His dialectic movement for him is the dogmatic distinction of good and evil." (121-2)

Marx repeated his pro-slavery view in a letter to Annenkov dated December 28, 1846. In this polemic against Proudhon lies the answer to Marx's support to the slaveholders' war against Mexico. Approaching the question of Negro slavery not in a "humane" but in a philosophical-Hegelian way, Marx coldly viewed it merely as an economic category. Proudhon, according to Marx's criticism, wanted to save slavery by eliminating its "bad" side. To Marx no such problem existed. Cotton made modern industry possible, and since cotton production could be achieved only through Negro slavery—then, so he thought—whether one liked this condition of the Negro or not, one had to accept it as a vital component of world economy. Marx and Engels could not visualize the Negro producing cotton on a wage-labor basis. In this respect Marx and Engels were behind some bourgeois economists. Present-day Marxists point out: "Adam Smith and Arthur Young, heralds of the industrial revolution and wage-slavery, were already preaching against the waste of chattel-slavery." *(New Int.* Dec. 1939, 341). The Marxists would naturally prefer to cite Marx, but he held a pro-slavery position which was not above the position of the ideologists of the South who appealed to the unscientific business sense of international Capitalism to approve Southern Negro bondage on the assumption that the discontinuance of cotton production would ruin capitalist industry. Bourgeois historians record: "Calhoun in a powerful speech delivered in the Senate of the United States in 1839 . . . flung out the assertion that slavery, in the existing state of society, was not an evil but 'a good—a positive good . . . the most solid and durable foundation upon which to rear free and stable political institutions.' " (Beard, *The Rise of American Civilization,* I, 704, 705)

With respect to Marx's statement that America would be wiped off "the map of nations" if slavery were abolished, Engels in a note to the 1885 German edition of *Poverty of Philosophy* said: "This was perfectly correct for the year 1847." (Cited in *Pov. of Phil.* Int. Publ. XXVI, 94-5). Marx and Engels held to their faulty reasoning for many years after the *Communist Manifesto.* "In 1850 Engels had surmised that the future abolition of Negro slavery would ruin the existing productive system." (G. Mayer, *Friedrich Engels,* 172). That is why Marx and Engels hailed the United States' seizure of Mexican territory. It meant the expansion of slavery, for "In the new territory

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

slavery had been forbidden under Mexican law." *(Enc. Brit.*, XXVII, 701). Flowing from their economic position on slavery was their view, also held by pro-slavery ideologists, that the Negro in the United States was "not ready for emancipation."

On June 14, 1853, in a letter to Engels, Marx ridiculed a work *Slavery at Home and Abroad* by H. Carey, a Northern economist, in which the author attempted to prove that the United States Negro had been prepared for emancipation by the American conditions of life. Marx said: "The only thing of positive interest in the book is the comparison between the former English Negro slavery in Jamaica, etc., and the Negro slavery of the United States. He shows that the main body of Negroes in Jamaica, etc., always consisted of newly imported barbarians, as under English treatment the Negroes were not only unable to maintain their population but lost two-thirds of the number annually imported; the present generation of Negroes in America, on the other hand, is a native product, more or less Yankee-ised, English speaking, etc., and therefore *fit for emancipation.*

"The *Tribune* is of course trumpeting Carey's book with all its might. Both indeed have this in common, that under the guise of Sismondian philanthropic socialistic anti-industrialism they represent the Protectionists, i.e., the industral bourgeoisie of America. This also explains the secret why the *Tribune* in spite of all its 'isms' and socialistic humbug, can be the 'leading journal' in the United States.

"Your article on Switzerland was of course a direct smack at the leader in the *Tribune* (against centralization, etc.), and *their* Carey." (Marx's emphasis. *Sel. Corr.* 69)

John Brown's partisan war against the slaveowners in Kansas (1854-8), his seizure of the arsenal at Harper's Ferry (Oct. 16-18, 1859) and the rebellions of the slaves in various parts of the United States were not only never hailed by Marx and Engels but were obviously viewed by them with apprehension lest a general rising of the Negroes would break the backbone of the chattel system upon which, they believed, the whole industrial fabric of society rested. In a letter to Engels dated January 11, 1860, a little over a month after the execution of John Brown (Dec. 2, 1859), Marx expressed concern over the fate of Manchester, the centre of British textile industry where Engels' factory, from which they both drew sustenance, was located: "I have just seen in the *Tribune* that there has been a fresh rising of slaves in Missouri, naturally suppressed. But the signal has now been given. If things get serious by and by, what will then become of Manchester?" *(Civil War in U. S.* 221)

Events were sweeping toward the Civil War. In the 1860 elections due to the splits in the Southern forces, victory went to the Republicans represented by Lincoln. One of the chief bones of contention between the Republicans and the Southern slaveholders was the status of slavery in the Territories not included in any state. "The Republicans demanded that Congress should legislate for the prohibition of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

slavery in the Territories; and the Southern Democrats demanded that Congress should legislate for the protection of slavery in the Territories." *(Enc. Br.* XXVII, 705). On December 20, 1860, following the news of the election results, the slaveholders' convention of South Carolina seceded from the Union. Now the issues—except the issue of Negro slavery specifically as such—could lead only to war. And war, for the South, held the risk of elimination of the slave institution. Engels, apparently, understood this. On January 7, 1861 he wrote to Marx: "Things in North America are also becoming exciting. Matters must be going very badly for them with the slaves if the Southerners play so risky a game. The least volunteer *putsch* from the North could set everything ablaze. In any case, it seems that one way or another slavery is rapidly going to come to an end, and then it will be the same with cotton production." *(C. W. in U. S.* 221)

When the Civil War broke out a secret disagreement arose between Marx and Engels as to the military outcome of the conflict. Engels stubbornly held that the South would be victorious. Marx thought that the North would win. But the difference was actually based on the subjective attitude of each. Engels still clung to the viewpoint that Negro slavery was the indispensable pillar of modern economy and therefore wished for the success of Confederate arms. But Marx showed clear signs of shifting to an anti-slavery position and began to back the North. His new viewpoint was due to a decisive change in the economic perspective of the British textile manufacturers who, deprived of American cotton, had begun to seek means of freeing themselves from the slaveholders' monopoly of this vital material. Writing five months after the outbreak of the Civil War, Marx, in an article for the *Tribune* which held a strong anti-slavery position, said: "English modern industry, in general, relied upon two pivots equally monstrous. The one was the potato as the only means of feeding Ireland and a great part of the English working class. This pivot was swept away by the potato disease and the subsequent Irish catastrophe. A larger basis for the reproduction and maintenance of the toiling millions had then to be adopted. The second pivot of English industry was the slave-grown cotton of the United States. The present American crisis forces them to enlarge their field of supply and emancipate cotton from slave-breeding and slave-consuming oligarchies." *(N. Y. Daily Tribune,* Oct. 14, 1861; XII, 2, R. 186; *C. W. in U. S.* 19)

Marx understood that the thesis he had penned in the letter to Annenkov "Without slavery you would have no cotton" was exploded. There was yet another reason, very important to him politically, for abandoning his pro-slavery position. Marx had to maintain a progressive appearance before the advanced workers and Left bourgeois-democratic elements. During the Mexican War he and Engels had faced a delicate enough situation, because many people both to the Right and to the Left of them understood that it was a robber war

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

on the part of the Polk Administration. Not only Lincoln and other representatives of industrial bourgeoisie and the Abolitionists opposed the war but some workers' organizations did too. One of them was —*"The National Reform Association*—a mass workers organization formed in 1845 and struggling for agrarian reform, against slavery and for a ten hour work day. The Association protested against the war with Mexico." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LI, 702)

Marx and Engels at that time had resorted to a political sleight of hand and supported the foreign policy of the Southern slaveholders on the pretext that Mexico was backward and would be better off if dominated by the United States. But now what pretext could they have devised for backing the slave power in its war *within* the United States against the advanced North and in the face of indignant opposition to the South from all progressive-minded elements of the entire world! Engels, however, left evidence to show that privately he favored the slaveholders. His warmth and respect for the Confederate generals and his confidence in their efforts to resist the attempts to crush the slaveholders are almost transparently obvious in his letter to Marx immediately after the Confederate victory in the Second Battle of Bull Run (Aug. 28-30, 1862). It is to be noted that Engels ironically put the word *rebellion* in quotation marks after the style of Southern sympathizers:

"The Bull Run affair #II, was a capital bit of work by Stonewall Jackson, who is by far the best chap in America . . . the lads in the South, who at least know what they want, strike me as heroes in comparison with the flabby management of the North. Or do you still believe that the gentlemen in the North will crush the 'rebellion'?" (Letter of Sept. 9, 1862. *C. W. in U. S.* 253-4)

Engels would not have been in the least perturbed if "the best chap in America" and "the lads in the South" were to come out victorious and tighten the yoke of chattel slavery on the neck of the Negro masses for several more decades. He firmly believed that "the gentlemen in the North" would fail, that "Without slavery you would have no cotton, without cotton there can be no contemporary economy." Engels had also a private interest in the situation, ". . . since the war affected the cotton market, he was interested in it also from a business point of view." (Mayer, 172)

A few more words of explanation are in order as to why Marx and Engels, prior to the Civil War, stood for the perpetuation of Negro slavery. As we have seen, they believed as late as 1861 that with the ending of slavery the production of cotton would cease (Engels to Marx Jan. 7, 1861). Holding that cotton constituted the main pillar of industrial economy and that the Negro would produce cotton in no other manner than under the lash of the slavedriver, these two German nationalists and proletarian burocrats already during Polk's annexation of Mexican territories looked forward to the creation of a mighty Germany. The chattel enslavement of the Negro

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

for the production of cotton would guarantee, to their thinking, the development of German industry. British industry was mainly textile based on American-grown cotton—German industry would have to surpass the British on the same basis.

It was no accident that in the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels did not present a position on so important a social and economic phenomena as Negro slavery, the Jewish Scapegoat and the enslavement of the peoples of Asia, Africa and other backward areas; Marx and Engels stood for the perpetuation of Negro slavery in the United States, accepted the British "civilizing" of India, the Tsar's "civilizing" of the Bashkirs and other Eastern peoples, the Sultan's oppression of the South Slavs and they detested and hated the Jews.

Marx and Engels in general held a false position on chattel slavery. Some years after the Civil War Engels wrote his *Anti-Duhring.* In it he touched upon the matter of slavery in Ancient Greece and Rome and emphatically argued that without the existence of that slavery there would be no Socialism: "Without slavery, no Greek state, no Greek art, and science; without slavery, no Roman Empire. But without Hellenism and the Roman Empire as a basis, also no modern Europe. We should never forget that our whole economic, political and intellectual development has as its presupposition a state of things in which slavery was as necessary as it was universally recognized. In this sense we are entitled to say: Without the slavery of antiquity, no modern socialism." (200)

In the primitive stage of the evolution of mankind, thousands of years before Rome, slavery was undeniably a step forward as against cannibalism. It was certainly more "progressive" to make a captive work rather than to eat him. However, to present the *decaying* stage of the chattel institution of the Roman Empire as a *necessary* stage for Socialism is to condemn all the risings of the Ancient slaves as reactionary. And by holding in the age of steam-driven machines and the modern proletariat, in the period of writing the *Communist Manifesto,* that Negro slavery was necessary for modern industry, Marx and Engels revealed their subjective intent and interests, not an objective analysis of a social phenomenon.

We now shall draw the line of distinction between Marx's crime against the Negroes and his crime against the Jews. The only time Marx made inimical statements about the Negroes was when he called Lassalle "Jewish nigger" and talked about Lassalle's "negro impudence." Otherwise he evidently harbored no hatred toward the Negro. Engels did not slanderously speak about Negroes being swindlers, but he did about Jews—"Jewish swindlers like Disraeli." (Letter to Marx, Sep. 24, 1852. *Sel. Gor.* 60). Engels never used such expressions as Negro intrigues, but he did make anti-Semitic remarks about "Zhid" intrigues: "In all my life I haven't had so many Zhid intrigues simultaneously as at this time." (Letter to Marx, Nov. 1864. XXIII, 203). There is no record of an attempt on Marx's part to incite lynch-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ing of Negroes, whereas there *is* documentary evidence of his policy of inciting the Polish priests and "revolutionists" to pogroms against the Jews. The Marxist scholars sense a greater need to conceal Marx's attitude toward the Jews than his position for Negro slavery in view of the fact that the latter position is not readily discernible. Moreover, Marx's outspoken attacks on Negro slavery in the Inaugural Address of the First International, in the Addresses to Lincoln and Johnson and in other documents during and following the Civil War make an ideal cover for his original support to the slaveholders. On the Jews, however, Marx never reversed his position. In consequence, the Marxists must guard against the exposure of his virtually open anti-Semitism, and one of the methods is to amalgamate the case of the Jew with that of the Negro, putting the second somewhat in the foreground and labelling the whole "The Question of oppressed racial minorities," or "The national question."

3. *The Stalin Support to Negro Anti-Semitism*

In their practical activity the Stalin burocrats often conceal or ignore anti-Negro sentiments in their own camp and, as record proves, even advance Negro anti-Semitism. The first feature is proved by the fact that they completely disregarded Dreiser's White chauvinist malevolence when he said that the Negroes in South Africa overran the land *(The Nation,* April 17, 1935). But the printing of Dostoyevsky's *Diary of a Writer* by the Bolshevik State without a note of criticism of his incitement of the Negro masses against the American Jews which that work contains proves the culpability of the Stalin burocracy. Dostoyevsky's Negro anti-Semitic incitement reads: "I have just read in the March issue of *Vestnik Evropi* the news that the American Jews in the Southern States have already fallen en mass upon the millions of liberated Negro masses and have already laid hold of them through their well-known, eternal 'gold trade,' taking advantage of the inexperience and vices of the exploited people. And just imagine, when I read this I immediately recalled that five years back this very thing came to my mind, namely, that though the Negroes have been now freed from the slaveholders, but they cannot remain so because the Jews of whom there are so many in this world will at once fall upon this fresh victim. I thought this, and I assure you, several times during this period I had the following in my mind: 'how is it that nothing is heard about the Jews, no reports in the newspapers; these Negroes are a treasure to the Jews, is it possible they will miss their chance? And sure enough the papers reported and I have read." (Dostoyevsky, XII, 80. State Publishing. Moscow-Leningrad, 1929)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XV.

THE JEWISH BOURGEOISIE, JEWISH THEOLOGY AND BOURGEOIS ATHEISTS PROMOTING ANTI-SEMITISM

1. *The "Fortune" of the American Jewish Bourgeoisie—one of its Misfortunes*

IN ALL recorded history, no segment of a class has been in such a paradoxical situation as the Jewish bourgeoisie. Consciously or not, the Roman emperors, the Church and the Feudal aristocracy, and above all the modern Gentile bourgeoisie, would allow a temporary social and material rise of a section of the Jewish population. This semi-privileged section, while always serving the native rulers, would perform the function of a target, bearing the brunt of the charge that the Jews as a whole were a vampire sucking the lifeblood of humanity. For periods of time the wealthy and educated Jews actually rose above the peasantry and the proletariat and in some respects even above sections of the native bourgeoisie and gentry. However, at crucial turns of history these Jews would be exterminated in the general Jewish carnages and their accumulated wealth would be seized by the ruling powers or would be cast to the pogrom mobs as a reward for their bloody work. Thus it was with the Crusaders, with the exterminators of the Jews during the Black Death, with the Black Hundreds, with Petlura's Haidamaks, the Nazi Storm Troopers and many other butchers of the Jews.

The periods in which the Jewish bourgeoisie is fattened for the kill are longer than the extermination periods. Therefore the "peaceful" periods of "toleration" have been accepted as the norm in the life of the Jewish bourgeoisie, and the pogroms have been looked upon as abnormalities. Factually they are the two component features of the same phenomenon, just as war and "peace" are two closely integrated conditions in the development of mankind.

As the United States advanced from the agricultural to the industrial stage, the American Jewish bourgeoisie was extremely successful as a junior "partner" of the Gentile owners of the basic economy of the country. A fabulous period of tremendous wealth in America was ushered in during the War of 1914-18. Agonized Europe was in ruins, its bourgeoisie virtually bankrupt, while a stream of gold flowed across the Atlantic to the capitalists of the United States. Although this era of prosperity was followed by severe economic crises, a new American boom, even greater than the previous one, began in 1939, after Hitler's invasion of Poland, and continued for a number of years. It was precisely during the Nazi period of extermination of Jews that the American bourgeoisie, including the Jewish

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

capitalists, achieved unprecedented accumulation of wealth. The Jewish capitalists, though poor in comparison with the Christian capitalists, the real masters of American economy, stand in material wealth and class position above the Gentile proletariat and the farmers and high above the Negro masses and the Negro bourgeoisie. The Jewish capitalists in the United States not only became the wealthiest of contemporary Jewry but amassed more riches than all the Jewish merchants and usurers in a thousand years of Feudalism. Yet, paradoxically, the very "fortune" of the American Jewish bourgeoisie constitutes its misfortune. As we have seen, the Defamation is a functioning force in the economic, social and political life of the United States. The material wealth of the American Jewish bourgeoisie is pointed to by the Defamers as ill-gotten in contrast with the "honest" and approved colossal acquisitions of the Gentile bourgeoisie. There are historical examples of the Jews in similar situations and the outcome was invariably annihilation. In Feudal Spain, for instance, the Jews attained a "golden age" which was a prelude to the fires of the Inquisition. Loyal and devoted to that Christian country, the Jews aided in expelling the Islamic conquerors and for nearly a century and a half enjoyed great wealth and influential position. But the "fortune" of the wealthy Jews aided the Spanish Defamers in hastening the elimination of the Jews from Spain. "The Jews, who had suffered cruelly from the brutal fanaticism of the Almohades, had done a great deal to forward the conquest of Andalusia. They were repaid by the confidence of the king, and the period which included the reign of Fernando and lasts till the end of the 14th Century was the golden age of their history in Spain. In 1391 the preaching of a priest of Seville, Fernando Martinez, led to the first general massacre of the Jews, who were envied for their prosperity and hated because they were the king's tax collectors. *But the history of the persecution and expulsion of the Jews is the same everywhere except in date.*" (*Enc. Brit.* "Spain," XXV, 546. Our emphasis—G. S.)

The Jewish bourgeoisie in the United States has been loudly proclaiming its devotion to the dominant Gentile capitalists and has proved in action its loyalty to their interests and policies. It considers itself an inseparable part of the American nation. But the active Defamers, whose work is reaching ever deeper into the diverse classes of the non-Jewish American population, White and Negro, say, "This is a *Christian* nation, and the Jews are not a part of it."

The elevated station of the American Jewish bourgeoisie in finance, industry and commerce, and the recent shifting of the center of the world Jewish population to the United States create an ideal setting for the use of this traditional historical Scapegoat should a serious crisis occur in the country. Whereas in pre-Nazi Germany the Jews constituted only 1 per cent of the total population, in the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

United States they are almost 4 per cent of the population, nearly as high as in Feudal Spain and in Tsarist Russia.

Owing to purely objective developments of history, and not at all to the subjective desires of the active Defamers, the "golden age" of the Jewish bourgeoisie in America may well have entered the last stage. American capitalism is no longer young. In the past it vigorously marched across an immense virgin continent, evolving, after the discovery of gold in California (1848), toward the position of the world's leading industrial and financial power amidst the expanding world capitalist system. With the military failure of the Nazi invasion of Russia the United States remained standing amid the ruins of decadent Capitalism, while half of Europe and most of Asia passed into the hands of the Marxist dictators. In America itself, beneath the artificial prosperity and calm, the rumbling of a serious general crisis has long been reverberating. And the Jewish Scapegoat is conveniently gathered in large numbers on the American scene.

The dominant Gentile capitalists have allowed the Jewish bourgeoisie in the United States to prosper. As in pre-Hitler Germany, members of the Jewish bourgeoisie in America have been welcomed into Government posts. It was thus, too, in Feudal Spain. At the time Ferdinand and Isabella issued the Edict of Expulsion (March 31, 1492) the Minister of finance in the Spanish Government was a Jew, Don Isaac Abarbanel. He pleaded for revocation of the Edict. But the Spanish ruling nobility, in whose ranks were many Jewish descendants, had resolved upon decisive action against the Jews. Torquemada, then the greatest enemy of the Jews, as we have shown, was descended from Jews, and as to the King who twelve years earlier had established the Inquisition in Spain, we read of the "Jewish parentage of Ferdinand." (A. A. Neuman, *The Jews in Spain*). Comparisons show that neither in the Ancient Jewish State nor in any other country up to the Twentieth Century were the Jews as prosperous as in Spain. "History established that the Jews never lived as well as in Spain prior to the inquisition and expulsion. They had achieved all they desired." (Theodore Herzl before the Parliamentary Commission on Immigration, July 10, 1902)

After the War of 1914 the Jews in the United States advanced toward a higher level of prosperity than the Jews in Spain. But just as in Spain a few decades prior to the expulsion, so in the United States ominous clouds have been gathering. Concurrent with the international economic political and military crisis there has been growing a network of organized anti-Semitism. Already poison-pens have appeared propagating complete extermination of all the Jews in the United States: "Sooner or later the matter must come to a climax. Either the Jews must win out, and install in the United States the same sort of a Gentile-liquidation bund they so tragically installed in Russia, or the Christians of the United States must put

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the issue of conniving Jewry above all other issues and treat with it dractically. *This means a pogrom—of colossal proportions!* A POGROM, lest there be any among us unfamiliar with the word, is a wholesale slaughter of Jews merely because they *are Jews* . . . It never occurs to the Jew to avoid this sort of debacle by being a good citizen, by keeping a place in society commensurate with his minority, with living and letting live. He must push through to dominance or he fails to be a Jew. All of which is another way of saying that being a Jew, he *cannot avoid creating his own ultimate pogrom* . . . The Jews are committing themselves to a tragic program of 'Liquidate or be Liquidated!' Sooner or later the climax must mature." *(Pelley's Weekly,* "Is a Pogrom Inevitable?" Editorial, July 22, 1936)

The program of total extermination of the American Jews did not originate with the Silver Shirts but had been advocated for many years. Thus in a book *Seventy Summers,* Poultney Bigelow, one time associate of the *New York Herald,* said: "Today the United States has probably more Jews than all the rest of the world . . . They cannot yet be elected to a social club of importance, but soon the white race in America will be too poor to afford any club. When that day arrives we shall all join the Klu Klux. We shall then be too hungry to distinguish between good and bad Jews—we shall have a grand and bloody house-cleaning and commence life anew on an old fashioned 100 per cent American basis." (Cited in *J. D. B.* Jan. 24, 1926)

The United States Government never stopped the American pogromists in their calls for Jewish blood. If Pelley was imprisoned it was not for pogrom agitation but on charges of inciting insubordination in the Army. Occasional jailings of avowed anti-Semites by the capitalist State has often misled the Jewish workers and the Jewish bourgeoisie who naively believed that they were safe with bourgeois democracy. The Hitler lesson establishes that in one situation bourgeois democracy jails overt anti-Semitic leaders, in another it facilitates their assumption of power and the extermination of Jews.

The professional Defamers in the United States quite realistically wait until the Henry Fords follow the example of the Farbens and of other industrial magnates in the bourgeois-democratic Weimar Republic and decide to make use of their services. Meanwhile they have been sowing passionate hatred against the Jews, centering the venom particularly on the Jewish merchants, manufacturers, bankers and political leaders, portraying them as plotters to enslave the world. They look to the future with confidence. "Sooner or later the matter must come to a climax." They visualize themselves seizing a far richer booty than any that has ever fallen to the exterminators of the Jewish Scapegoat.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *The Jewish Theologians an Objective Aid to the Pogromists*

When the Nazis began to destroy millions of Jews in Europe, even the deeply religious Jews, who had always during pogroms prayed for heavenly succor, were jolted out of their self-hypnotism and became aware of certain stark realities the entire Jewish group faced. It had begun to dawn upon them that the study of the Torah and the Talmud could not ward off the modern gas chamber; that in fine, their Jehova was not protecting them against anti-Semitism: "Children are sent to religious schools not so much to 'study Torah' as to learn the answers to Jew-baiting slanders. Zionists base their appeals not so much on the need for revitalizing a dormant Israel as on that of finding a permanent solution to the problem of anti-Semitism. Rabbis tend to be appointed not as scholars and teachers but as 'ambassadors of good will' to the Gentiles." ("Some Methodological Errors in the Study of anti-Semitism," by Shlomo Bergman, *Jewish Social Studies,* Jan. 1948, 43)

But while the religious Jews have been trying to oppose anti-Semitism by what they regard to be educational means, they at the same time have been clasping to their bosom an asp which has been supplying venom to the Defamers for centuries. This asp is the Talmud, the Torah and the entire Hebrew dogma. Since they themselves believe, or pretend to believe, in holy miracles, they have been unable to refute the Christian myths which constitute a central factor in anti-Semitism. Their story that "Jacob was born circumcised" (Ab.R.N.11.5; Gen. R. lx III.7) is comparable to the Church story that "Christ" was born of "immaculate conception." Knowing full well that the Church was unable, despite its most frantic efforts, to present even a shred of authentic historical data to establish that a man named Jesus founded the Christian sect in the Ancient Roman Empire, that there had ever been such a man, the Jewish theologians pretended to accept his existence but argued with the Church over the circumstances of this mythical person's birth. They insisted that he had been born of adultery. A Jewish Zionists writer points out: " . . . these *Talmud* stories seem as though they are deliberately intended to contradict events recorded in the Gospels; the self-same facts are perverted into bad and blameable acts. For example, the Gospels say that Jesus was born of the Holy Spirit and not of a human father; the *Talmud* stories assert that Jesus was indeed born without a father, yet not of the Holy Spirit but as a result of an irregular union." (J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth,* 19)

The Jews' accrediting the existence of Christ constituted a big victory for the Church. Taking it from there, the Christian sources merely had to reject as malicious the Jewish inventions of the circumstances of his birth: "The historical character of Jesus Christ is also attested by the hostile Jewish literature of the subsequent centuries. His birth is ascribed to an illicit ('Acta Pilati' in Thilo, 'Codex

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

opocryph. N. T.' I, 526; cf. Justin, 'Apol.' I, 35), or even an adulterous, union of His parents (Origen, 'Contra Cels.', I, 28, 32)." *(Cathol. Enc.* VIII, "Jesus," 377)

Paradoxically, the ancient Hebrew religious system supplied the basis for the entire Christ myth. "The Jewish sources furnished the terms Father, Messiah, Son and Spirit." *(Enc. Brit.* VI, "Christianity," 284). *Daniel* (7) introduced the idea of the coming of the Messiah, and *Psalms of Solomon* (17.8) set the approximate date of the "coming" near the Christian Era. The new Jewish sect merely claimed that the Ancient prophesy had been fulfilled, that the Messiah, or Christ had arrived according to schedule. This put the old Jewish sects in the position of having to reject their own prognostication.

The Jewish-Christian sect proselytized among the Gentiles and its beliefs found wider and wider acceptance until this sect lost its secular Jewish character and became a widespread Gentile religion. Thereupon all the Hebrew oral and written slurs against non-Jews were implicitly applicable against the Christians. These slurs were embodied in the Jewish theological works, such as the Talmud, and the maintenance of these works by the religious Jews has provided anti-Semitic Defamers with strong weapons against the Jewish Scapegoat. The following quotations from Hebrew sources are found in the Christian Defamatory writings:

" 'If a Jew has struck his spade into the ground of a Gentile, he has become master of the whole.' *(Baba Batra,* 55a). 'In Abhoda Zarah (26 b, Tosepoth) it says: 'Even the best of Goim should be killed.' " (Rev. I. B. Pranaitis, *The Talmud Unmasked,* 83; Edmondson *Jew Exposure Patriotic Bulletins,* May 22, 1939)

"Airplanes recently circled over the cities of Los Angeles, Hollywood and San Diego, dropping thousands of anti-Semitic handbills. Chicago, New York and other cities report similar tactics. Here is a photographic copy of one of the bills dropped down on Los Angeles: 'Jews! Jews! Jews Everywhere! . . . The Jewish Talmud Says: "Jews are human beings, Gentiles are not human beings, but beasts" (Baba Mezia, 114,6).' " (L. S. Bauman, *The Time of Jacob's Trouble,* 74-5)

The so-called Prophets allegedly chastised the Jews, using most scurrilous language, and modern Jewish bourgeois historians strengthen the hand of the active Defamers by upholding the mythology of the Ancient Jews: "The first of the literary prophets of the canon was Amos . . . He disturbed the national self-complacency by citing and denouncing the sins of the people and of their civil and religious rulers, declaring that precisely because God has chosen them to be His own would He punish them for their iniquity. He rebuked their oppression of the poor, their greed, their dishonesty, as sins against Yhwh Himself; assured them that their excessive religiousness would not save them in the day of their deserved punishment." *(Jewish Enc.* "Prophets and Prophecy" X, 214). "Isaiah deals much with the same themes as Amos and Hosea: the sins of luxury, fashion,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and frivolity in men and women; landgrabbing . . ." (215). According to the invented stories of the Jewish theologians, Isaiah transmitted the following statements from "Jehova" to the Jews: "Because the daughters of Zion are haughty . . . therefore the Lord will smite with a scab the crown of the head of the daughters of Zion . . . And it shall come to pass that instead of sweet smell there shall be stink." (Cited in *The Cry for Justice,* 473-4). "Your hands are full of blood. Cleanse yourselves! Purify yourselves! Remove your wicked deeds from mine eyes! Cease do evil! Learn to do good!" *(Is.* I, 10-20). "Ah sinful nation, A people laden with iniquity, A seed of evil-doers . . ." (I, 4)

Hosea, according to the Jewish religious fiction, said that the Jew "is a merchant, the balance of deceit are in his hands, he loveth to oppress." (H. 12: 2, 7. Cited by L. S. Bauman in *The Time of Jacob's Trouble,* 105). Bauman is proud of all the vile attacks on the Jews by the "Prophets" because, he says, Israel never concealed its faults. But he is led to observe: "Thus, the very accusations that the Gentiles have hurled against the sons of Judah for centuries, were first hurled by Jehova Himself, speaking by the mouth of His prophet." In the light of this observation, the originators of the anti-Jewish Defamation were not Manetho or Homer but the unwitting Ancient Jewish theologians of almost three thousand years ago.

Micah, another Jewish "prophet," supposedly analyzed the character of the Jewish rulers as follows: "Hear this, I pray you, ye heads of the house of Jacob, and rulers of the house of Israel, that abhor judgment, and pervert all equity." (Cited in *The Cry For Justice,* 410)

Another "prophet" transmits to the Jews the decision of "Jehova" to punish them: "I will . . . deliver them to be removed to all the kingdoms of the earth, to a curse, and an astonishment, and a hissing, and a reproach, among all the nations whither I have driven them." *(Jeremiah,* XXIX, 18). "The wickedness of my people Israel." (VII, 12-14)

The Christian Defamers hint that their hounding of the Jews represents the punishment foretold in the Jewish Bible: "Every book of the Old Testament warned Jewry as a race that if its unbelief and materialism continued, it would be dispersed (as at present) and punished (Ezek. 39: 23-24, Dent. 28: 64-67, II: 26-28, Zech. 13:9, etc.)." (Rev. Frank W. Johnson, *The Octopus* 17)

Among the fictional tales of the Ancient Jews few are as damaging to the Jewish Scapegoat as the story of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Jacob's sons. The Christian story of immaculate conception has its counterpart in many religions. It is paralleled in the Ancient Jewish superstitious concoction that Abraham and Sarah begot a son, Isaac, when they were past their period of fertility—through the divine intervention of Jehova. "Is anything too hard for the Lord?" *(Gen.* 18:14)

The next episode of the Abraham miracle is that after Isaac had grown up, Abraham was ready to murder him as a sacrificial offering

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to "Jehova." This portrayal of the maniacal fanaticism of the mythical Abraham, described by the Rabbis as the father of the Jews *(Gen.* XI), has often been employed by the Defamers. A British lord in the Eighteenth Century stated: "As for myself, I would subscribe to any loss. I would not, indeed, sacrifice my children, for that would be a heathen and Jewish offering, but I would sacrifice that which I believe Abraham loved better than he did Isaac—my fortune, rather than see England lie dormant under the present circumstances." (Malmesbury, *Diaries and Correspondence,* 1844. II, 102)

The mythical Jacob, named *Israel* by mythical Jehova *(Gen.* XXXII. 20), was described by the Ancient Jewish writers as the father of the twelve ancestors of the tribes of the Jews. These writers portrayed Israel, or Jacob, as a crook. He took advantage of the simplicity of his brother Esau, for whom the father had preference, and cheated him out of his birthright by paying him a mess of pottage for it. Then, disguised as Esau, he tricked a blessing intended for Esau from their blind father Isaac, who was on his deathbed. The Rabbis, as the Jewish historians' records show, were impelled to do some twisting to cover up the invented Jacob since it was impossible for them to reject the Hebrew mythology: "The Rabbis attempted to explain that Jacob did not intend to deceive his father in the words, 'I am Esau thy first-born *(Gen.* XXVII, 19), but meant by them: 'I am the one whose children will accept the Decalogue which begins with I ('anoki'); but Esau is thy first-born' (Gen. R. LXV. 14; Yalk. Gen. 115)." *(Jewish Enc.* VII, 22)

With all their dishonest efforts to inject a different meaning into the narrative, the Rabbis have been unable to erase the original picture of the alleged Jewish patriarch as a swindler and impostor. Jacob's sons were portrayed by the Ancient Jewish theologians as not much different in character from their swindler father. Envious of their younger brother Joseph they conspired against him and sold him into slavery. One of Jacob's "sons," Simeon, treacherously attacked the people of Shechem. Another "son," Levi, whose descendants, the Levites, represented the tribe of the priests of Israel, participated in this crime: "Levi shared in Simeon's treachery toward the men of Shechem *(Gen.* XXXIV. 25-30)." *(Jewish Enc.* VIII, 20). Another "son," Reuben, was also portrayed as a criminal by the scribes. Finally, when Jacob was near death—so goes this stupid and politically very damaging fictitious tale—he summoned his "sons" and showed that he held the opinion that they were scoundrels *(Gen.* XL). And these worthies, the world was informed by the Jewish theological "thinkers," were the patriarchs and direct progenitors of the twelve tribes of Israel! *(Gen.* XXV.21 to 1.13)

The romantic figure of King David *(Sam.* XVI-I, *Kings* II), was also portrayed as a criminal character by the Ancient Jewish religious fiction, and his blackest deed is recorded by the Jewish historians: "*Uriah.* Hittite warrior of David, listed as one of the thirty or thirty-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

seven chief heroes of the latter's army (II, Sam. 23:39). He was killed in battle during the siege of Rabbah in Ammon, through a treacherous withdrawal of the forces supporting him, by the order of David, who used this means of covering up his intrigue with Uriah's wife Bathsheba, and marrying her." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* X, 381)

It might be argued that priests of almost every non-Jewish nation lashed its sinners, as Jonathan Edwards and Cotton Mather did in the American colonies. But there is an important difference there. No nation has been functioning for thousands of years as an established social and political Scapegoat except the Jews. No organized movement ever existed to collect the verbal outbursts of Edwards, Cotton Mather and other hysterical Christian priests for the purpose of proving that the American nation was descended from thieves, cutthroats and swindlers as is done in the case of the Jews. The frenzied scourging of the Jews by the Ancient Jewish priests has become a current coin of the Black Hundreds, the Nazis, and the Edmonsons everywhere. Leaning heavily on the Jewish theological tomes, the International Defamers zealously and intelligently point out two clearly defined stories: one, that Jehova himself cursed the Jews as he had not cursed any other nation and that he distinguished foul traits in the Jews, which served as an indication that their character was in an advanced state of degeneration when their "race" was in its very infancy; two, that Jehova chose as his own this "race," which he himself described as corrupt, lewd, treacherous, iniquitous, greedy and hypocritical, and promised to place it above all other nations. "Ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me and above all people." *(Exodus,* XIX, 5); "the Lord hath chosen thee to be a peculiar people unto himself, above all the nations that are upon the earth." *(Deut.* XIV, 2); "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and the holy nation." *(Exod.* XIX, 6). Jehova was shown to have special love for the treacherous David: "The seed of David will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne for ever and ever." *(Psalm* 89). Solomon's Psalm 72 pictures a Jewish King ruling over all nations: "The kings of Tarshish and of the isles shall render tribute; The kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall prostrate themselves before him." The Jewish theologians insist that their most revered "prophet" of the Old Testament made the following prediction to the Jews: "The sons of the aliens will build your walls and their Tsars will serve you." *(Is.* LX, 10)

Combining these two features—the vilification of the Jews and the prophesy of Jewish power—in "the Jewish menace" the Defamers declared that the world was justified in massacring the Jews as a measure of self-defense: "The so-called 'Anti-Semitism' was not invented by Adolph Hitler, nor Madison, Grant or Theodore Dreiser, or any other score of German or American writers. It is as old as the Jewish race itself. For wherever the Jews have invaded a land to take this into themselves as promised to them by Jehovah, infesting that country with the disruptive, destructive qualities peculiar only to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

their national character, it was but natural for such a people to turn upon them in self-defense. Being no longer able to stamp this battle of self-defense by a people whom they first attacked with their *economic strategy,* as 'religious prejudice' they are now terming it 'racial prejudice' and 'intolerance.' " *(American Bulletin,* May 8, 1935, 3)

The Nazis made elaborate use of the Jewish theological anti-Semitic poison. Eight months after Hitler was placed in power, the Jews were making ready to gather in the synagogues on the eve of Yom Kipper to recite the ritual *Kol Nidre,* which is a combination prayer-declaration that the Jews are freed from all previous vows and obligations. The alert Nazis used the *Kol Nidre* among the German masses for anti-Semitic purposes: "Berlin, Sept. 26—the full text of the 'Kol Nidre,' the prayer used to open the services on the eve of the Day of Atonement is being published in several anti-Semitic papers here to support their contention that the Jews never take their oaths or pledges seriously." *(J. D. B.* Sept. 27, 1933)

Defamers outside of Germany approved of the Nazi drive against the Jews and gave the *Talmud* as the reason: "It is their own creed, 'The Talmud,' which condemns them. One can scarcely blame Hitler for driving them out of Germany, after they have read this infernal document, 'The Talmud.' " (From a letter received by the *Christian Social Action,* Sept. 1939, 115)

Through the Talmud and their other religious writings, the Jewish theologians have exposed the Jews to anti-Semitic attacks not only by the Church and the pogromists but even by bourgeois Left Christians. Thomas Jefferson wrote: ". . . the philosophy of the Hebrews must be inquired into, their Mishna, their Gemara, Cabbala, Jezirah, Sohar, Cosri, and their Talmud, must be examined to do them full justice. Brucker, it would seem, has gone deeply into these repositories of their ethics, and Enfield, his epitomizer, concluded in these words: 'Ethics were so little understood among the Jews, that in their whole compilation called the Talmud, there is only one treatise on moral subjects . . . It may serve to give the reader some idea of the low state of moral philosophy among the Jews in the middle age . . . What a wretched depravity of sentiment and manners must have prevailed, before such corrupt maxims could have obtained credit! It is impossible to collect from these writings a consistent series of moral doctrine.' Enfield, B. 4, chapter 3. It was the reformation of this 'wretched depravity' of morals that Jesus undertook." (Letter to John Adams, Oct. 13, 1813. *Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* Monticello Ed. XIII, 388-9). "That sect had presented for the object of their worship, a Being of terrific character, cruel, vindictive, capricious, and unjust. Jesus, taking for His type the best qualities of the human head and heart, wisdom, justice, goodness, and adding to them power, ascribed all of these, but in infinite perfection, to the Supreme Being, and formed Him really worthy of their adoration. Moses . . . instilled into his people the most anti-social spirit towards other nations; the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

other preached philanthropy and universal charity and benevolence. The office of reformer of the superstitions of a nation, is ever dangerous. Jesus had to walk on the perilous confines of reason and religion; and a step to right or left might place Him within the grasp of the priests of the superstition, a bloodthirsty race, as cruel and remorseless as the Being whom they represented as the family God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob, and the local God of Israel. They were constantly laying snares, too, to entangle Him in the web of the law." (Letter to William Short, Aug. 4, 1820, XV, 260). Jefferson called the Jewish religion a *depraved religion:* "But the greatest of all the reformers of the depraved religion of his own country was Jesus of Nazareth." (Letter to William Short, Oct. 31, 1819, XV, 220; *Basic Writings of Thomas Jefferson,* Foner, 764)

Thomas Paine was moved by the Hebrew Biblical myths to a violent outburst against the Jews: "Could we permit ourselves to suppose that the Almighty would distinguish any nation of people by the name of *His chosen people,* we must suppose that people to have been an example to all the rest of the world of the purest piety and humanity, and not such a nation of ruffians and cut-throats as the ancient Jews were; a people who, corrupted by and copying after such monsters and impostors as Moses and Aaron, Joshua, Samuel and David, had distinguished themselves above all others on the face of the known earth for barbarity and wickedness." ("Preface" *Age of Reason,* II)

The theological mental enslavement of the Jewish Scapegoat has been maintained against the grim background of unparalleled mass extermination by the Nazis. In the formerly Nazi-held territories—"Jewish refugees were found in mountain caves with their scrolls of Torah and religious books." *(Britannica Book of 1944,* 376). "Even in a world of war the Torah was still going forth from Zion, and from Palestine came the news of a projected new edition of the Hebrew Bible under the auspices of the Hebrew University, an encyclopedia of the Scriptures and a new edition of the Talmud." (377)

A few years more after Hitler and the surviving handful of Jews that barely escaped the mass extermination was flooded with Jewish religious literature: "Prayerbooks, copies of the Talmud and other Jewish books were increasingly made available for furthering Jewish cultural life in the war-devastated countries of continental Europe." *(Ib.* 1948, 421). In the United States the rabbis set out on a gigantic campaign to spread the Ancient Jewish anti-Semitic writings among the American Jews: "In an effort to 'promote and clarify' orthodox Judaism in the United States, the Rabbinical Council of America has instituted a 'Torah Tour,' a nation-wide program aimed at strengthening existing orthodox institutions. The council represents 400 American-trained orthodox rabbis in 400 communities. Under the 'Torah Tour' program, the council has organized its members into regional teams which visit urban and rural communities to encourage

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

an orthodox Jewish life and halt trends which 'tend to pave the way to assimilation.' " (*N. Y. T.* March 7, 1950)

Despite the fact that the Jews have been used as a social-political Scapegoat for more than two thousand years, not a single voice has arisen either among the great Jewish or the Gentile bourgeois thinkers, nor, since Marx, among the erudite Marxists theoreticians, to explain to the Jewish Scapegoat and to the Gentile masses that the Torah and other repositories of Jewish religious myths constitute ideological fuel for anti-Jewish pogrom passions. And so, while these repositories aid anti-Semitism, the religious Jews cling to them with all their might. As their hymn *Eli, Eli* says:

"With fire and flame they have burnt us
Everywhere they have shamed and derided us,
Yet none amongst us had dared depart
From our Holy Scriptures, from our Law."

3. *The Anti-Semitic Nature of Bourgeois "Atheism"*

The bourgeois atheists, like the Marxists, do not acquaint their followers with the role the Jews play in society. Camouflaging their true political essence with what appears to be an attack on all superstitious beliefs and social injustice, they often wind up with an attack on the Jewish group. The following serves as an illustration: "Because of the Bible, science was throttled for hundreds of years, Galileo was made to recant, Spinoza was cursed by the synagogue and ostracized by Jews, and heretics died at the stake. Its pages are proof of the fact that the ancient Israelites were an ignorant and superstitious tribe, who believed in polygamy, human slavery, and animal sacrifice, and groveled in the basest superstitions. So long as the harem-king Solomon, the profligate David, and the rape-inspiring Moses are heroes of the Bible, there can be no incentive for a higher pattern of behavior. The modern Jew who wishes to play a useful part in the community will do well to discard Judaism, by forgetting the superstitions of the past, none of which has contributed either to his own enlightenment or to the progress of the world. Dr. Morgenstern is correct and, while orthodox Jews may howl at him, he has placed his finger on the sore spot of Jewish life. Israel—we repeat his words—'has made no contribution whatever to human civilization.' " (W. Teller, *Essays of an Atheist,* 341-2). Within this passage are concealed some of the features found in undisguised form in the propaganda of the professional Defamers: 1) The modern Jew plays no useful part in the "community." 2) Contributions to "human civilization" were made exclusively by non-Jewish peoples.

A leading Freethinker writes: "Therefore they enjoined the Jewish people to give this diseased and poisonous flesh to the stranger dwelling among them, or to sell it to aliens. And may we not conclude that it would be asking too much to expect an enterprising Jew to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

give away what he might sell?" (Marshall J. Gauvin, *Fundamentals of Freethought,* 110-111)

4. *The "Good-Will" Empty Hope of the Jewish Bourgeoisie*

The appalling fate of the Jews in Europe terrified but did not enlighten the most "advanced" ideologists of the Jewish bourgeoisie in America, the guides of the majority of the Jewish masses. The specific reaction of these Jewish bourgeois ideologists to the ever-growing pressure of the Defamation has been varied. Some have reflected a common desire among certain Jewish elements to dim the burning memory of the pictures of Nazi horrors and to relieve the tortured mind by minimizing the danger of physical attacks on the American sector of the Jewish Scapegoat. Elsewhere we have cited the Marxist opiate "Germany is not Italy" which aided the Nazis in taking control of Germany. An opiate of a similar nature has appeared among the American Jewish bourgeoisie—*the United States is not Germany!* In a bulky four-volume work published in 1949 this opiate is introduced on the basis of admitted ignorance of the strength of anti-Semitism in America:

"Unfortunately, thus far no comprehensive study of anti-Semitism in the United States from a sociological, psychological and statistical viewpoint has been made. We are likely to be overwhelmed by specific case histories without realizing that the proportion of philo-Semites may be as great as, if not greater than, the proportion of anti-Semites in the general population. The tendency on the part of those who continually warn the Jews of America against anti-Semitism is to neglect emphasizing the fact that the United States, in many important particulars, is not the same as Germany." *(The Jews,* ed. by L. Finkelstein, President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, IV, 1280)

If the Jewish bourgeois "thinkers" took the trouble to make at least a surface survey of anti-Semitic penetration in the United States they would have discovered that "in many important particulars" the United States may be led by invisible powers along the German road. They would have carefully weighed such reports as the one which appeared after the termination of the Hitler rule:

"The War Department this week confirmed, in reply to a query by the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, that anti-Jewish views were disseminated among U. S. armed forces throughout the world in an official educational correspondence course established under the auspices of the Army and Navy and issued by the U. S. Armed Forces Institute at the University of Wisconsin." *(Jewish Exponent,* June 29, 1945)

H. W. Levy, New England Regional Secretary of the American Jewish Committee has also dropped some of the United-States-is-not-Germany opium, if in somewhat different phrases, into the mind of the Jews: "Don't talk as though the anti-Semites were too great a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

menace in America today. Remember that Nazism is a foreign importation. The note to strike should be: *It must not happen here.* We must avoid building up a band-wagon psychology that would make men believe that anti-Semitism is the big thing of the moment. To exaggerate the danger in the minds of Americans generally would be almost suicidal in its effect." *(American Democracy and Judaism,* 12). This is the same tragically foolish line pursued under the Nazis by some Jewish leaders in Germany who objectively aided Hitler to prepare the bloody calamity for European Jewry: "German-Jewish leader says reports of Anti-Semitism in Germany are exaggerated." *(J. D. B.* April 23, 1930)

Jewish bourgeois leaders like Levy prefer to overlook the fact that Defamation was present in America centuries before any one ever heard of the Nazis. Anti-Semitism was a "foreign importation," but so was the English language; so were the Gentiles and the Jews. However, ideologists of the Levy type are not numerous. The other schools of Jewish bourgeois thought have realized that evasion or ignorance of the truth is no security against the growing threat to the remainder of Jewry. Less and less too is heard the fatalistic and fatal refrain that since the Jews survived the swords of the Crusaders, the fires of the Inquisition, the Tsarist and White Guard pogroms, and even Hitler's gas chambers, they would survive further trials and massacres. A realization has been dawning that longevity is not perpetuity and that the last days of the peculiar group called "Jews" might be near at hand—not through assimilation but through annihilation as a political Scapegoat!

Throughout the writings of the Jewish bourgeois leaders can be detected a note of helplessness. Signs of inability to cope with the Defamation multiply. All theses boil down to one "solution"—an appeal to the ruling Christian forces: "The chief responsibility for fighting anti-Semitism rests with the Christian Church in America." *(Opinion,* Dec. 1943, 6). "No, the task to be done is to destroy anti-Semitism at its place of origin—Christian tradition. It is a job the Christians must do themselves, and every consideration of religion, fairness, and humanity cries out that it be done at once." *(How to Combat Anti-Semitism in America. A Symposium,* 22)

It has become a pattern in Capitalism that during the periods when the anti-Semitic tide runs particularly heavy, eminent bourgeois leaders from the Scapegoat group and from the dominant Christian community get together in fraternal spirit and discuss means and ways of eradicating the Defamation. The high Christian authorities, while maintaining the whole anti-Semitic structure and tradition of the Church intact, express verbal sympathy for the hounded Scapegoat group: "The pope condemned anti-Semitism, by reminding the Christian world that 'spiritually, we are all Semites.' " *(10 Eventful Years,* I, 131, pub. by *Enc. Brit.).* One Christian-Jewish gathering, calling itself Emergency Conference to Combat Anti-Semitism, took place in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Summer of 1947 in Selisburg, Switzerland. Unable to dismiss the fact that both the Christian and the Jewish religions feed the flames of the Defamation—"The delegates, representing Catholics, Protestants and Jews in 17 countries, ended their week long parley with a proposal to religious leaders to revise such teachings as the story of the Crucifixion of Christ, in order to eliminate religious bias. Jewish delegates stressed that they would eliminate attacks on Jesus from Jewish instruction and to promote good relations between Christians and Jews." *(Jewish Exponent,* Aug. 15, 1947)

Some of the comment of the *Jewish Exponent* reads: "All the fine phrases about religious tolerance and good will and better understanding to which we have been treated in recent years, become meaningless when considered in the light of some of the catechisms, as well as other text books and prayer books, still in use in countless number of Christian religious schools and churches throughout the world." *(Ib.)*

A clergyman states that Christianity has been enhancing its anti-Semitic inculcation of the mind of the Christian population:

"It should, therefore, be clearly stated that the inescapable fact is that anti-Semitism is promoted *on a major scale* at the teaching and preaching of Christendom. For seventeen centuries Christian teaching of a violently intolerant nature has been directly responsible for outrages against the Jewish people . . . Yet the sinister truth is that not only has anti-Semitism remained in the teachings of many other churches, but that of late it has been substantially enhanced. Very many Christian institutions today through the spread of anti-Semitic intolerance, are providing the United States with a bloodstained pathway backwards toward the unending years of pogroms which blackened the European scene." ("Anti-Semitism is a Christian sin," by Rev. W. Ellis Davies. *The Protestant,* May 1944, 22)

A group of eminent American Christians, including some leading Protestant clergymen, have issued "An Appeal to Christian leaders" which, among other things, contains the following: "Before God, we, the Christians, are the guilty ones; we are the source, if not the sole cause of anti-Semitism . . . We must examine and correct our teachings and our literature." *(Jewish Forum,* Jan. 1951)

Apart from the fact that Christianity is not the source, nor the cause of anti-Semitism, since the origin of anti-Semitism predates the Christian anti-Jewish traditions, and the *cause* is not religious but *political,* what all the "good-will" clergy, Jews and non-Jews, have been suggesting, some probably in all sincerity, is that the ruling Christian bourgeoisie order its Church, and the Jewish bourgeoisie order its Synagogue, to repudiate the Old and New Testaments. That neither the Christian nor the Jewish bourgeoisie would ever adopt a policy of rejecting their respective religions is fairly obvious. The "good will" movements have been unable to influence the Church even to the extent of revising the prayer recited on every Good Friday: "Let us also pray for the perfidious Jews; may the Lord our God re-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

move the veil from their hearts so that they, too, may acknowledge Jesus Christ our Lord. Almighty Eternal God, Thou who dost not exclude from Thy compassion even the perfidious Jews . . ." As to the anti-Semitic power of this centuries' old prayer, a Christian clergyman indicates: "The prayers said for the Jews in the Latin liturgy of the Catholic Church for Good Friday speak of *perfidi Judaei* and of *Judaica perfidia.* For centuries these expressions were rather widely understood by analogy with phrases resembling them in modern Romance languages [French, Spanish, etc.—G. S.] 'perfidious Jews' and 'Jewish perfidy' . . . the unfortunate translations of the liturgical phrases exercise a wide and unhappy influence on Christian sensibilities . . ." (Rev. Father Paul Demann, *Documentation Catholique,* July 17, 1949)

What the "good will" tendencies have always overlooked, or deliberately concealed, is that the two religions are mutually exclusive. Charles Lamb, famous English essayist and critic, widely known also for his "Dissertation upon Roast Pig" but not too well known as a hater of the persecuted Jewish group, long ago correctly felt that the outward show of friendship between supporters of the Church and those of the Synagogue is nothing but a thin cloak to disguise the irreconcilable antagonism between Christianity and Judaism: "I have, in the abstract, no disrespect for Jews. They are a piece of stubborn antiquity . . . But I should not care to be in the habits of familiar intercourse with any of that nation. I confess that I have not the nerves to enter their synagogues. Old prejudices cling about me. I cannot shake off the story of Hugh of Lincoln. Centuries of injury, contempt, and hate, on the one side,—of cloaked revenge, dissimilation, and hate, on the other, between our and their fathers, must and ought to affect the blood of the children . . . I boldly confess that I do not relish the approximation of Jew and Christian, which has become so fashionable. The reciprocal endearments have, to me, something hypocritical and unnatural in them. I do not like to see the Church and Synagogue kissing and congeeing in awkward postures of an affected civility." ("Imperfect Sympathies," *The Comp. Cor. and Wks. of Charles Lamb,* Moxon, London, 1870, II, 245-6)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XVI.

MARXISM'S HAND IN CREATING THE REACTIONARY ZIONIST STATE

1. *Dr. Herzl's Policy of Friendship with Pogromists*

SINCE THE annihilation of the Jewish State by the Romans (70 C.E.) many Jews dreamed of reestablishing the Jewish State, believing that the Jews would thereby free themselvs from the Goluth, or exile and oppression. At first their outlook was for physical action which finally expressed itself in the immense Revolt of Bar Kochba against the Roman power (132-5 C.E.). After the revolt was suppressed no attempts at armed action were made; and the idea of escaping the tortures inflicted by the Defamers and pogromists was confined to waiting for the Messiah and the occasional formulation of some vague plan to reestablish the Jewish kingdom. Those who advanced such a plan are too numerous to be listed here in full. There was Serenus (720), David Alroy (1147), Sabbatai Zevi (1626). In 1695 Oliger Pauli called upon William III of England to support the reestablishment of a Jewish State in Palestine. In 1714 a French aristocrat Marquis de Langallier negotiated with the Sultan of Turkey for the formation of such a State. Napoleon considered the project. The Russian anti-Semitic bourgeois revolutionist, Colonel Pestel, advocated the idea. Lord Palmerston appeared to be in favor of a Jewish State. (Finn, *Stirring Times*, I, 106-112). However, no attempt to organize such a movement succeeded. On the other hand the Mendelsohn reform movement within the Jewish bourgeoisie weakened the old Messianic beliefs and strengthened the illusion that by substituting a modernized Judaism for the musty religious ideology the problem of integrating the Jewish population into the body politic of the Christian States would be solved. Throughout the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century the story of the "emancipation" of the Jews was written in a series of Blood Accusation trials, pogroms and growing discrimination. The result was an upsurge of the hope of reviving the Jewish State as a means of escape.

In the Nineties a new figure arose, a Jewish bourgeois journalist, a native of Austria, who founded the modern Zionist movement. He began as a Christian assimilator: "In 1893, Herzl had advocated conversion to Christianity as a solution for the Jewish question in Austria. His idea was to reach the Pope and in return for his help against anti-Semitism, Herzl would lead a movement among the Jews for the conversion of the young to Christianity." (J. M. Rosenberg, *The Story of Zionism*, 33)

In 1896 Herzl published a book, *The Jewish State*. He advanced the understanding that whatever rights the Jews had been granted in the past would be taken away and that this could only mean that the Jews would gradually be driven into a social and political ostracism resembling the one they had endured for many centuries prior to the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

French Revolution. Unable to grasp that Anti-Semitism and the Jewish Scapegoat formed a *permanent institution* in class society, Herzl laid the causes of anti-Semitism to the supposed inability of the Jews to assimilate. However, the Jews of Germany, Austro-Hungary and France were assimilating to an extent and at a rate never witnessed in Jewish history. Herzl was in a contradiction; he failed to understand that the cause of the growth of anti-Semitism was the accentuation of economic and social contradictions of Capitalism, the intensification of class antagonisms and the danger to the Tsar and the world bourgeoisie from the growing forces of the proletariat. Recognizing that "Every nation in whose midst Jews live is either covertly or openly anti-Semitic," Herzl expounded the thesis that only by creating a Jewish State and by gathering a large part of the Jewish population into this State would anti-Semitism be eradicated from the world. He not only excluded the idea of struggling against anti-Semitism but believed in making use of "decent" anti-Semites: "It would be an excellent idea to use decent and accredited anti-Semites as liquidators of capital . . . It is the anti-Semites who will be our staunchest friends and the anti-Semitic countries which will be our allies." *(Tagebucher,* I, 93)

What was in Herzl's mind when he wrote that the pogromists and tormentors of the Jews would be great friends of Zionism? Sufficiently discerning in some respects, Herzl saw that a central feature of anti-Semitism was the demand, Out with the Jews! However, not even the openly anti-Semitic governments, such as the Russian and Rumanian, publicly raised this demand. Since, as it seemed, the active anti-Semites passionately wanted to rid the Christian world of the Jews in some concrete, practical way, it would only be natural for them to cooperate with Herzl's Zionism, the only existing movement that professed to advance a policy that met with their desires. In his *Jewish State* Herzl conceded the anti-Semitic charges that the Jews were a nuisance to the Gentile world: "When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate officers of all revolutionary parties; when we rise, there arises also our terrible power of the purse."

The Zionist founding Congress in 1897 adopted a resolution on Abdul Hamid, the cruel and despotic Sultan, which threw some clear light on Zionism's attitude toward tyrants and butchers of oppressed peoples. From 1888 to 1895 Hamid's savage Kurds had sacked numerous Armenian towns and committed appalling atrocities against the Armenian masses, slaughtering tens of thousands. World reaction to these massacres created a difficult situation for Hamid: "The Armenian massacres had inflamed the whole of Europe against him, and for a time the Ottoman Empire was in a very serious peril. Dr. Herzl's scheme provided him, as he imagined, with a means of securing powerful friends. Through a secret emissary, the Chevalier de Newlinsky, whom he sent to London in May 1896, he offered to present the Jews a charter in Palestine provided they used their influence in the press

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and otherwise to solve the Armenian question on lines which he laid down. The English Jews declined these proposals, and refused to treat in any way with the persecutor of the Armenians." *(Enc. Brit.* "Zionism," XXVIII, 988)

The English Jewish bourgeoisie who in that period did not support the Zionist cause but rather followed the line of assimilation in England, sided with the general world sentiment against the Sultan. However, Herzl and his followers were not interested in the blood-drenched Armenian villages but in the overtures of the despot Abdul Hamid, and when they gathered in 1897 in Basel to found their Zionist movement—"The first act of the Congress was the adoption of a resolution of thanks to the Sultan of Turkey." (Louis Lipsky, Introduction to Herzl's *The Jewish State)*

Herzl's policy was to make friends even with open anti-Semites. His view was: the more diseased with anti-Semitism a Gentile was the better he would serve the Zionists: "To him it was a matter of indifference just how hostile a Gentile might be; indeed, thought he, the more anti-Semitic a man was the more he would appreciate the advantage of a Jewish exodus from Europe! (cf. the recurrent observation recorded in his Tagebucher, Vol. I, p. 93: 'It is the anti-Semites who will be our staunchest friends, and the anti-Semitic countries which will be our allies.' How he interpreted this notion in practice is revealed in a letter to Katznelson, written in connection with the Kishinev pogroms of 1903. In that letter he seeks to 'Derive some measure of advantage from the threatening calamity.' " (Hannah Arendt—"From the Dreyfus Affair to France Today" 215. *Essays on Anti-Semitism, Jewish Social Studies,* Publications #2)

A great anti-Semitic power which was the first to give sanction and administrative recognition to Zionism was pogromist Russia. In 1900 a Tsarist Governor refused to molest a Zionist celebration. He told a police prefect: "I am very familiar with the Zionist movement and I have for it much sympathy." *(L'echo Sioniste,* March 20, 1900, 222-3). It was reported that—"Russia has not only recognized officially the Zionist movement, but even favors it and encourages it in the most striking fashion." *(Ib.* Sep. 15, 1902, 188)

Herzl did not merely confine his thesis to paper but proceeded energetically to carry it out in life. There was in the Russian Government a sinister reactionary figure to whom the very term progress was anathema, a man who hated all tendencies to the Left of the Black Hundreds. He was the political initiator of pogroms since 1881. It was to him that the "savior" of the Jews, Dr. Herzl, addressed himself: "Herzl sought cooperation from Pobedonostsev, the procurator of the Holiest Synod, who, beginning under the rule of the previous Tsars, inspired the reactionary and anti-Jewish policy of the Russian monarchs. But Pobedonostsev paid no attention to the address to him." (M. Vishniak, *Doktor Weizman,* R. 79)

Herzl was not easily discouraged. He looked over his list of pros-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

pective anti-Semitic Russian contacts. A very powerful official in the Tsarist Government in 1903 was the Minister of Interior, Von Pleve, whose policy, as has been shown, was to drown the Russian Revolution in Jewish blood. "Wiatscheslav Konstantinovitch Plehve, a man of obscure parentage, 'of German blood with a Jewish strain,' Minister of the Interior and by common report the inciter of the Kishineff Massacre, was a power in Russia." (Jacob de Haas, *Theodore Herzl,* II, 142). Herzl decided that the perpetrator of Kishinev was the right man to deal with. Through the offices of a Black Hundred lady, Korwin-Petrovskaya, Pleve's attention was called to the Herzl program. In July 1903 she informed Herzl: "Von Plehve would be very happy to make the acquaintance of so interesting a personality as Dr. Herzl and would with all his heart support a movement for emigration without the right of re-entry." (141)

We do not know whether Korwin and Pleve read *The Jewish State.* If they did they certainly could have easily discerned that Herzl was a man after their own heart. In that book Herzl had made it quite plain that he was a confirmed monarchist: "Nations are also not really fit for unlimited democracy at present and will become less and less fitted for it in the future." *(The Jewish State,* 69). "I am a staunch supporter of monarchical institutions . . ." *(Ib.)* "I incline to an aristocratic republic." "It is impossible to formulate a wise internal or external policy in a popular assembly." (70)

While Madame Korwin was arranging an audience for Herzl he wrote to Pleve that he had no grievances over Kishinev—what had been done had been done. He further indicated that the propaganda for the overthrow of the pogromist autocracy was "revolutionary nonsense" in his view: "To von Plehve Herzl wrote directly. 'The deplorable events of Kishinev press the pen in my hand—but not to complain over the unalterable." (Jacob de Haas II, 133-134; Herzl's Letter in *Tagebucher* III, 431-432. Written from Vienna, May 23, 1903)

In August 1903 occurred one of the most thrilling events in Herzl's life. He was permitted to shake the bloody hand of the hangman of the Russian workers, peasants and Left bourgeois elements, the butcher of the Jews, von Pleve. "In many circles this journey of Herzl's to Russia was bitterly condemned later on; no Jewish leader, it was said, should have negotiated with Plehve, who was regarded as responsible for the pogroms . . . He was received twice, in a very friendly manner, by von Plehve . . . But his most important achievement was his acquisition of Plehve as a supporter of the Zionist aim . . ." (A. Bein, *Theodore Herzl, a Biography,* 447). During the reception Pleve said, "The relations which shall be established between the Imperial Government and Zionism and which can become, I will not say friendly, but understanding, will depend upon you." Herzl replied, "If they depend only on me, Your Excellency, they shall be excellent." (Jacob de Haas, II, 143)

On August 29, Pleve perpetrated the second Gomel pogrom. That

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the new bloody affair had been directed from the Government quarters was virtually indicated by the local governor. (M. Vishniak, *Anti-Semitism in Tsarist Russia;* cited in "Essays on Anti-Semitism" *Jewish Social Studies Publication,* II, 136-7)

Reports received abroad by the Jewish bourgeois press indicated that Pleve acted to disarm the Jewish self-defense in Gomel: "The Government is also taking strenuous measures to prevent the Jews from resorting to self-defense . . . Many arrests were made by the police of Jews who used weapons in self-defense during the time of the riots." *(Jewish Exponent,* Oct. 23, 1903)

Did Pleve's new crime against the Jews move Hezrl to break relations with this pogromist-Minister? Not at all! Herzl's thesis was "It is the anti-Semites who will be our strongest friends" and he rigidly adhered to it. Whether Pleve, Pobedonostsev and other high-ranking pogromists in Russia were friendly to Herzl is highly doubtful; that Herzl was sincere in seeking the friendship and support of these monstrous criminals there is no doubt. About two months after the second Gomel pogrom a rumor appeared in the international bourgeois press that preparations were afoot for a second Kishinev. "Alarming tidings have arrived from Kishinev that renewed excesses are being prepared for Christmas time." *(Jewish Exponent,* Dec. 25, 1903)

Herzl realized that the Tsar's Government would be embarrassed if it carried out immediately a new pogrom in Kishinev, for that would have indicated that the rumors were not baseless and would have definitely proved that the pogroms represented the policy of the Tsar's Government. Herzl decided to inform and forewarn Pleve: "May I be permitted to draw the attention of your excellency to an apparently controversial piece of news, but which is now making the rounds of the European press. They are circulating the report that there will be new massacres in Kishinev on the occasion of the Russian Christmas holidays. For me, this is an abominable invention; but I believe I ought to warn you about it, in view of the fact that I am now acquainted with your very humanitarian views. Please believe, Excellency, in my high regard and my sincere recognition, Th. Herzl." *(Tagebucher,* III, 536). Herzl did not consider it his moral duty to warn the *Jews* and the subjectively anti-Tsarist elements among the Gentile bourgeoisie and the proletariat. A short while after Herzl's warning to Pleve, the Tsar's government organized more pogroms, postponing the second Kishinev to September 4, 1904, when the rumor to which Herzl had called Pleve's attention had been erased from most people's memory.

In the first stages of its development Herzl's movement met with violent opposition from various Jewish bourgeois quarters and from the proletariat. The Bund rejected Zionism as an ultra-reactionary movement extremely harmful to the Jewish masses. The Jewish workers, the Bund stated, had no other country except the one in which they happened to live, and it was their right and duty to fight shoulder

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to shoulder with the Russian, Polish and other masses for the overthrow of all the oppressors and for the liberation of the Jews and other persecuted groups. The orthodox rabbis opposed Herzl on the ground that his movement was contrary to the Jewish religious teachings regarding the eventual coming of the Messiah divinely sent as a deliverer of the Jews. The reformist Synagogue felt that Zionism would militate against Jewish assimilation and would strengthen the anti-Semites' argument that the Jews were strangers in the Christian world. Only a very small fraction of world Jewry, some capitalists but largely petty bourgeois intellectuals, thought they had found an answer to the "Jewish problem" in Herzl's program.

2. *Herzl's Successors Give Aid and Comfort to the Defamers*

In July 1904 Herzl died. After his death, even more so than during his life, his ideas held the Zionists spellbound and he became the best-loved and most respected figure of Zionism. Spiritually and politically he was succeeded by David Wolfsohn, a banker, and Max Nordau, a journalist. "D. Wolfson attempted to imitate Herzl and followed his policy." (M. Vishniak, *Doktor Weizman,* R. 88). As to Max Nordau, his policy had always been wholly consistent with Herzl's position of official non-interference in the pogroms and the persecution of the Jews. A good example is Nordau's speech at the Second Zionist Congress in 1898: "France, the France of the Great Revolution and of the Declaration of Human Rights, the country that first gave Europe the example of the legal emancipation of the Jews, France is today marching at the head of the anti-Semitic movement . . . You are all aware of what has served as pretext for the outbreak of Jew hatred in France. It is the Dreyfus Case. This Congress, which is representative of the Jewish race in its totality, has no reason to take up the Dreyfus Case. It is not an affair of the Jewish race; it is an inner affair of the French nation." (A. and M. Nordau, *Max Nordau A Biography,* 141-2)

Nordau's declaration against Zionist interference in such anti-Semitic explosions as the Dreyfus Affair and Herzl's correspondence with the Tsar's pogrom Minister are only two of the numerous examples proving that Zionism, despite its pro-Jewish veneer, was established as an objective auxiliary agency of the Defamation.

Zionism has not confined its assistance to anti-Semitism to the political field but has extended it to the ideological field as well. Much of the Defamation, as we have seen, has been built-up around the mythical figure of Jesus. Zionism shared in the acceptance of this figure. Nordau wrote:

"If Jews have not hitherto publicly paid homage to the sublime moral beauty of the figure of Jesus, it is because those who have always tortured, persecuted, slain them, have done so in His name. The Jews have judged the Master by His disciples . . . We claim as our Jesus,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

His doctrine, His morals, His conception of life and the Gospels, except that of St. John."(Nordau's reply to a letter from Loyson. Cited by A. and M. Nordau in *Max Nordau,* 340, 341-2)

As we see, the Zionist leader rejected the *Gospel of St. John* but accepted the other *Gospels;* yet the *Gospel of Matthew* not only accuses the Jewish priests of delivering Jesus to Pilate and demanding his crucifixion, but states that the Jewish people took upon themselves and their children the guilt for shedding his blood. *(Mat.* XXVII, 24, 25)

The Christian rulers recognized the value of such people as Max Nordau. When he showed sympathy for Greece which was involved in a conflict with Turkey, "The Greek government honored him with the cross of a Commander of Saint Savior." (A. and M. Nordau, 345)

Although Zionism pretended to stand aloof from the politics of the international bourgeoisie, facts belied its pretense. "The outbreak of the world war in 1914 split the World Zionist Organization into three sections: those in the Allied, Central and neutral countries." (Lotta Levensohn, *Outline of Zionist History,* 61). In Russia the Zionist bourgeoisie and workers gave support to the Tsarist war policy which, as we have seen, included military anti-Semitism. In the West the Zionist leaders made a deal with the British imperialists to induce Jewish workers and capitalists to shed their blood in the interests of British imperialism for a paper promise to facilitate the formation of a Jewish State.

Zionism greeted the Kerensky regime as a true democracy, and after the October Revolution Zionist factions gave direct or indirect support to Denikin or Petlura. We have referred elsewhere to Dr. Pasmanik, an agent of the Denikin regime. Pasmanik asked his pogromist friends to abandon the tactic of slaughtering the Jews—not on the ground that this tactic was a heinous crime but because it "leads to no good." He did not ask them to stop spreading the nightmare of anti-Semitism: "Our task—to unite all forces for struggle against the Soviet dictatorship which is equally destructive for the Russians, for Jews and for the whole world. But in order to achieve this goal it is imperative that all Russians reject the *pogrom* and *political* anti-Semitism which, as the experience of the White movement established, leads to no good. We do not say that they must reject anti-Semitism in general. Such a demand is a utopia. The Jews do not solicit love. In the emotional sphere hatred of Jews will remain for a long time, but it must disappear from the realm of positive rights and political mutual relations." *(The Russian Revolution and the Jews,* R. 189)

Within the Jewish proletariat a separate Zionist faction arose, combining in its program Marxist ideas with the thesis of Dr. Herzl. "The Jewish Socialist Labor Party, Poale Zion, is an international party of Jewish workingmen organized for the purpose of liberating the Jewish masses . . . A Jewish republic in Palestine will free the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Christian nations as well as the Jews of the Jewish problem." (H. Fineman, *Poale Zionism,* 7, 20). Although the Marxist-Zionist leaders professed to struggle for the liberation of the Jewish masses, their policies tied them to the Zionist bourgeoisie and, therefore, indirectly, to the Defamers and pogromists. A clear example of this can be given by citing the attitude of the Marxist-Zionist toward the Polish semi-Fascist, Marshal Pilsudski. That Pilsudsky was a hater of Jews and a masked pogromist was common knowledge in many circles. Pilsudski was a friend of Petlura, and when the latter was assassinated in Paris for his appalling crimes against the Ukrainian Jewish population, Pilsudsky sent a special representative to attend the funeral of his pogromist friend. *(J. D. B.,* June 2, 1926). In May 1926, just in this period of the assassination and funeral of Petlura, Pilsudski led a military movement in Poland to oust the bourgeois-democratic regime of Wojciechowsky and to form a military dictatorship. Pilsudski received support not only from the anti-Semitic Polish Socialist Party and its Bund satellite but also from the Poale Zion: "The city government was taken over by the Pilsudski forces. The general strike was proclaimed Friday by the Polish Socialist Party and the Jewish labor parties, Bund and Poale Zion, as an expression of sympathy with Pilsudsky . . ." (*J. D. B.,* May 18, 1926). The Poale Zion in actuality followed the policy of the Zionist bourgeoisie: "Zionist Deputies are instructed to cast vote for Pilsudski regime." *(Ib.)*

3. *Zionists Strike up Deals with Hitler*

Among Zionism's numerous crimes against the Jews one of the most heinous was the series of trade pacts concluded with the Hitler Government: "Berlin—Sept. 1—George Halperin, well-known Zionist leader and a director of the Anglo-Palestine Bank, conducted the negotiations with the Nazi Land Trade League for the purchase of German goods by Palestinians in exchange for the opening of the German market to Palestinian citrus products, Herr Kintz, director of the fruit department of the Nazi commercial organization, revealed here . . .

"The announcement of the negotiations between the Palestine orange growers and the Nazi representatives aroused a storm of protest at the World Zionist Congress, when they were first announced by the Nazi authorities." *(J. D. B.,* Sept. 3, 1933)

Despite worldwide protests, the Zionist deals with Hitler were not terminated. A year later the press carried the following news from Germany: "The *Kleptzigs Anzeiger,* a technical paper in the metal and machine industry, discussing the role of the Jew in the anti-German boycott, says . . . 'in Palestine Germany is at present meeting with a very decent and systematic policy' . . . The *West Deutscher Beobachter,* one of the leading Nazi papers in Germany, also devoted an article to the question of Jewish participation in the anti-German boycott abroad. The paper reaches the following conclusion: 'Palestine,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in spite of the comprehendable disinclination towards National Socialist Germany, is for good reasons still proving itself a not unimportant customer for German machines.' " *(Ib.* Feb. 24, 1935)

On August 20, 1935, when their trade pact with Hitler had run for a considerable length of time, the Zionists opened their Congress at Lucerne, Switzerland. The President of the Congress, alluding to the Nazis, declared in the best Herzl tradition: " 'The enemies of yesterday are today close friends in order to become enemies again tomorrow. We have, therefore, no inducement to occupy ourselves in a Zionist Congress, from the standpoint either of international or of German politics, with what is called Nazism.' " *(American Hebrew and Jewish Tribune,* Aug. 23, 1935, 245)

Among some Zionists this friendship of the Zionist leadership with Hitler produced an outburst of disgust and indigation. The defense of the Nazi-Zionist deals was made by a leading Zionist Marxist, Ben Gurion: "Defending the Zionist Executive against charges of pussyfooting on the question of Nazi persecution of the Jews and on the transfer agreement David Ben Gurion, labor leader and head of the Political Department of the Zionist Executive at Jerusalem, declared: 'The World Zionist Congress is not a mass meeting where everything is permissible.' " *(Ib.* Aug. 30, 1935, 256). Ben Gurion and other Zionist leaders were characterized as agents of the Nazis: "The Congress was thrown into an uproar when the delegates of the Jewish State Party walked out of the Congress hall shouting 'Hitler Agents . . .' " (Sept. 6, 1935, 273)

It was brought out that the Jewish bourgeoisie of Palestine did business with the Nazis: "Palestine dealt heavily in German goods outside the so-called barter agreement, it was disclosed at one of the sessions. Figures presented by Schlomo Kaplansky, Laborite theoretician and member of the Congress presidium, showed that in 1934 $3,000,000 worth of German goods were sold in Palestine over goods involved in the barter agreement. Two-thirds of all the German goods sold in Palestine were not under the agreement, Kaplansky declared." *(Jewish Exponent,* Aug. 30, 1935)

The fact of private Palestine Jewish trade with the Nazis was confirmed sometime after the Congress by a Jerusalem newspaper correspondent: "Under the guise of 'Haavarah' operations, a large number of Jewish merchants in this country had conducted transactions with German industrial and commercial concerns, which, it was pointed out, increased their exports here to a total beyond that of even pre-Nazi days. These transactions were on a private profit-making basis, although masquerading as political exigencies. The general effectiveness of the proposed world Jewish boycott of German foreign trade was thus frustrated by evasion." *(Jewish Chronicle,* Oct. 18, 1935)

The following is part of a summary of the Congress: "The Congress met in the midst of the gravest crisis which has overtaken Jewry since the Spanish expulsion. Even while the Congress was in session,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Jews in Germany were being hunted like wild beasts, beaten and kicked like dogs, driven from public places, segregated in ghettos, boycotted, persecuted and humiliated as they have never been since the Dark Ages . . .

"It is an open secret now that if not for the persistent efforts of a small but courageous minority of all parties the Lucerne Congress would actually have ignored the Jewish tragedy in Germany. Even as it is, the gravest crisis in modern Jewish history was only skirted and glossed over, in an official and perfunctory manner . . . It is difficult to conceive a Jewish gathering less interested in Jewish affairs than was the Nineteenth Zionist Congress." (W. Zukerman, *Am. Heb. and Jewish Tribune,* Sep. 27, 1935, 324)

4. *Zionist Propaganda Aids Hitler*

Commerce was not the only sphere in which the Zionists and the Nazis saw eye to eye. Zionist propaganda in Germany often agreed with some of the Nazi opinions on the Jewish question and as a result Hitler gave the Zionists great leeway and encouragement. An article in *The Baltimore Sun* of May 18, 1934 was cited by *The Jewish Daily Bulletin* of May 23, 1934:

"Anything, on the other hand, which emphasizes Jewish separateness and the existence of a Jewish race is enthusiastically encouraged. For such teachings serve the Nazis as the confirmation of the fundamental thesis that the Jews are a foreign element in the German nation. Zionism, naturally, is therefore nursed by the Hitler regime, and the *Juedische Rundschau,* the organ of the Zionist organization of Germany, has practically quadrupled its circulation since the National Socialists took office. When the *Jeudische Rundschau* appears with a streamer across its first page reading 'Jeudische Eigenart' or Jewish uniqueness, the Nazis applaud, for this reflects their own views on the subject." Sixteen months later, on September 18, 1935, the Berlin correspondent of *The New York Times* cabled: "The Zionist paper (The Berlin *Jeudische Rundschau)* is given a considerable measure of liberty in expressing its opinions because in a limited form they tally with certain ideas of the Nazis."

Herzl's thesis that the anti-Semites would be the best friends of the Zionist movement was borne out again and again: "The Zionist movement is in a peculiar position in Germany. A certain section of it, the extreme wing of the movement, the Volkspartei, is definitely favored by the Nazi Government. The leader of that party, Herr Kareski, is openly advocating Nazism in Jewish life, and is, in return, favored by the Government. The more moderate Zionists, too, are in the good books of the Government, chiefly because their program of Jewish emigration from Germany happens to coincide with favorite solution of the Jewish problem advanced by the Nazis. The Zionist

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

movement, its press and other institutions, therefore flourish in Germany at present." *(The American Hebrew,* March 1936, 446)

Like Pleve, Hitler was a friend of Zionism, but never of the Jews. However, since the German Zionists were Jews, he finally exterminated them together with the rest of the Jewish population.

5. *Stalin and the Bourgeoisie Confer Statehood on Zionism*

Despite its treacherous anti-Jewish policies Zionism was emerging as a leading force within the Jewish Scapegoat. Rabbis, Orthodox and Reformist, began to visualize a majestic Home of Israel rising on the ruins of their lost glory. The Zionists were winning plaudits from Jewish financiers, professional men, literati and Jewish workers. Abraham Cahan, formerly an antagonist of Herzl's, visited Palestine and returned an enthusiastic supporter of Zionism. Professor Albert Einstein gave the Zionists his influential approval: "Through the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine, the Jewish people will again be in a position to bring its creative abilities into full play without hindrance." *(About Zionism,* 43). And even the Marxist Bund, originally the most violent Jewish opponent of the Herzl movement, "has made sensible approaches to Zionism." *(Jewish Enc.* XII, 685)

Zionism eventually received the backing of the Second International; the Stalin burocracy, while unalterably opposed to Zionism in Russia, and for many years opposed to it abroad, modified its policy. At the International Trade Union Conference held in London in February 1945, the Stalin delegation supported the Zionist cause and the Jewish Stalinists in May 1945 took a stand "for the free development of the Jewish National Home in Palestine."

On November 29, 1947 Stalin and the bourgeois powers partitioned Palestine between the Arabs and the Jews; the act signified the establishment of a Zionist State. The jubilation that swept the Jews in Palestine, in the United States and in other capitalist countries surpassed all the other celebrations in Jewish history. Jewish masses wept with joy, danced in the streets. Even the Arab-Jewish war that immediately followed the partition did not materially dampen the jubilant spirit of the Jewish masses who had been under the impression that with the formation of the Jewish State anti-Semitism would come to an end.

The leaders and promoters of Zionism, now the official spokesmen for the entire Jewish group, expressed their gratitude to the American bourgeoisie and to Stalin. "Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, speaking for the Jewish Agency, among other things stated the following: 'The Jewish people will be forever grateful to the nations which contributed to the decision. We are especially appreciative of the leadership provided by the United States and the Soviet Union.' " (243-4)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

6. *Expansion of Anti-Semitism after the Establishment of the Zionist State*

Following the formation of the Zionist State, anti-Semitism, instead of diminishing, rose rapidly in many countries. Among the Jewish bourgeois ideologists this created a greater fervor for the "salvation" offered by the Zionist State. On the other hand, small groups of the Jewish bourgeoisie clung with greater determination to the long exploded delusion that assimilation of the Jewish Scapegoat was possible in class society.

The creation of a "Jewish National Home" introduced a new danger to the Jews because it provided the anti-Semitic movement with a seemingly legitimate cover. As the article on anti-Semitism in *Britannica Book of the Year 1948* explained: "Discrimination against human beings in Jewish faith was one thing—and indefensible; opposition to a political theory (Zionism) was another—and legitimate. Not all Jews are Zionists. Unless the world learned and remembered that, the divisiveness of pro- and anti-Zionist, might wreak havoc wherever Jews lived, for themselves and the countries of which they were integral citizens."

The best example of the artificial lumping together of Zionists and non-Zionists occurred in England during the Arab-Israel conflict. The Zionists bitterly denounced the British government for its duplicity in arming the Arabs. Thereupon the Defamers in England levelled attacks upon all Jews—"the equating of Zionist and Jew began to add up to serious proportions in that country . . . The confusion of Zionism and Judaism and Zionist and Jew made it difficult to discern a trend in anti-Semitism for 1948. If the confusion persisted the English and Arab situation would almost inevitably spread." *(Ib.* 1949, 56). The Jewish bourgeoisie in England was seriously alarmed: "British Jews were reported to be raising a fund of $800,000 for combatting rising anti-Semitism." *(Ib.)*

In Italy anti-Semitism had been dormant for many decades, confined exclusively to Church agencies. Thus, *Civilta Cattolica* of Rome, whose editor was approved by the pope, declared in its October 3, 1936 issue that "the Jews constitute a serious and permanent danger to society." Attacks on the Jews were finally made official by Mussolini near the close of the Fascist era. In October 1949 the Rome Jewish Weekly *Israel* noted the steady increase of anti-Semitism in the Italian bourgeois press. *L'Azione,* a Catholic weekly, accused the Jews of "hostility toward the cross of Christ."

In Germany anti-Semitism had such a resurgence that—"On August 11, 1949 in Munich (American Zone), a German newspaper had no compunction in publishing a communication by a German, purportedly employed by the U. S. Military Government, saying that Americans in Germany 'forgive us everything except one thing: That we did not gas all of the Jews, for now many are enjoying life in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

America.' And the letter was signed *Adolf Bleibtreu*—meaning, ever loyal to Adolf Hitler." *(Workmen's Circle Call,* Sept. 1949, 7). This occurred in the fifth year of the so-called de-Nazification of Germany by the Western "democracies."

Under the American occupation authorities former Nazis returned to administrative posts in droves. *The New York Times* correspondent in Germany reported in the December 15, 1949 issue of the paper "the return of thousands of former Nazis to positions in the state and local governments. The administration of justice, the educational system, the finance ministry, all are full of former Nazis. This development has been accompanied by the reassertion of Nazi influence and, indeed, direction in commerce and industry." In the same month the bourgeois press carried headlines like this one: "Anti-Semitism Grips Germany, says U. S. Aid." (New York *Sunday News,* Dec. 11, 1949)

There was a report that into the midst of the wretched remnant of the Jews was introduced the torture of the Blood Accusation: "American military investigators and German police this week raided a house in the camp for displaced Jews in Fuerth, a suburb of Nuremberg looking for a Christian child who disappeared from his house. The disappearance of the child led to the spreading of rumors among the German population that he was kidnapped by Jews and slain 'for ritual purposes.' . . . German police and U. S. Army officers proceeded to search the house, but found nothing . . . many former Nazis have managed to join police force following their 'denazification.' " *(Jewish Exponent,* March 5, 1948)

Revival of Nazism in Germany has reached a point that "in Bavaria it is impossible today to get a government job without proof, not of denazification, but that one was a former party member!" (J. W. Wise, *Daily Compass,* March 29, 1950)

The Jewish bourgeois writers have begun to arrive at the realization that insofar as the Jews were concerned—"Hitler is winning his posthumous victory, easier and sooner than he anticipated. With American help and subsidies the German industrial potential is fast zooming upward . . . Those in industry, finance and public affairs who paved and eased the road for Nazism are back again in their strategic positions . . . Although there are almost no Jews left in Germany, anti-Semitism is on the upgrade and ancillary and auxiliary ideologies which precipitated the rise of Nazism are gaining. Hitler is having his *Der Tag* after all." *(Jewish Spectator,* Jan. 1950, 6). It should be added that Hitler's posthumous triumph was secured with the assistance from certain elements within the Jewish Scapegoat as well as from the Gentile "friends" of the Jews: "Jewish Lawyer to Defend Nazi Chief Who Led Pogroms . . . Winston Churchill has contributed $100 to this defense fund." *(Jewish Exponent,* Aug. 26, 1949)

The steady reinstatement of Nazi officials and the upsurge of anti-Semitism in Germany was duplicated in Austria. "Viennese Nazis are intensifying their anti-Semitic propaganda campaign and have ex-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tended their activities to Baden . . . The Socialist Mayor, Franz Meixner, attempted to minimize the anti-Jewish incidents." *(Jewish Chronicle,* Dec. 9, 1949)

With the launching of the Zionist State the tide of anti-Semitism rose in France: "Anti-Semitic activities in France have increased considerably during the past two years." *(Jewish Advocate,* Feb. 1949, 12). "Anti-Semitic elements in France, helped by the present economic crises, have, for the first time, obtained a considerable following among the French workers." *(Jewish Ch.* Dec. 16, 1949, 24)

In South America open anti-Semitism has taken a new upswing. Thus: "For the first time in the recent history of Peru an anti-Semitic publication has been established . . . exploiting the current economic depression, blames Jewish businessmen. It names Jewish-owned concerns and charges them with 'crimes' against Peru and its economy." *(N. Y. Post,* Feb. 16, 1949)

Organized efforts of the Defamers in the United States took on a new life after the formation of the Zionist State. A move was set on foot to unify the numerous anti-Semitic factions and to enlist the aid of influential Republicans and Democrats. G. L. K. Smith, the head of the "Christian National Crusade" declared with satisfaction: "We are pleased with numerous members of both the upper and lower houses of Congress." *(Daily Compass,* Oct. 26, 1949)

After the establishment of the Zionist State some bourgeois "atheists" made their anti-Semitic essence quite evident: "All Jews evade service, secretly promote wars and profiteer." *(Truth Seeker,* Aug. 1949)

A Jewish Liberal writer, criticizing some naive, or perhaps dishonest, Jewish leaders who attempted to minimize the growth of anti-Semitism in the United States since the formation of the Zionist State, wrote:

"In the days before the establishment of the State of Israel Zionist propaganda either implied or openly stated that the realization of Zionism would automatically put an end to anti-Semitism in the Diaspora . . . But in reality things necessarily worked out in a different way . . . Anti-Semitism—in legislative bodies, in the courts, in education, in the professions, in business, in the powerful media of communication, even in organized labor and religion—is infecting the political-social organism of our democracy. It is dishonest and dangerous to deny the growth of these evils." (J. Brainin, *Opinion,* Sep.-Oct. 1950, 16)

Quite an interesting innovation was introduced in St. Louis: "Jews are not considered 'White Americans' in a newly adopted police identification system in St. Louis . . . With the approval and cooperation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the old St. Louis rogues' gallery has been replaced by a highly-efficient modern IBM key punch-card system. Under this system a perforation is made on line 2 of the card if the arrested person happens to be Jewish; however, a 'White

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

American' has his card punched on line 5 of the same column. Americans of the Jewish faith are thus listed separately from other Americans by the record section of the St. Louis Police Department. A spokesman for the FBI described St. Louis' new system as the 'most progressive' in the country. Law enforcement officials have predicted that the St. Louis system will ultimately be adopted by police departments on a national basis. The religion of Jews is listed on these cards although there is no record kept of the religious preference of Catholics or Protestants. With the recent murder of 6,000,000 Jews in Europe, this listing is viewed with a note of alarm and resentment. Should the cards fall into the wrong hands, it would only be necessary to set the IBM card selector unit for line 2 of the appropriate category and the cards of all Jews would be instantly available. Those cards bear finger prints, photos, and all possible clues to identification. They are similar to cards made up by the Gestapo in 1933." *(Jewish Exponent,* Sept. 30, 1949)

In 1949 an anti-Jewish outburst of physical violence took place in Chicago. The spark that ignited the situation was a rumor that a house on the South Side, which had been purchased by two Jews, was to be resold to Negroes. The affair began on Tuesday night, November 8, 1949: "On Wednesday the mob gathered before the house again, but police still refused to disperse it. The police assigned to protect the house live in the neighborhood, and were on obviously friendly terms with the mob . . . The mob was estimated at 3,000. It continued its shouts until late at night: 'Let's have a necktie party. Kill the sheenies. Lynch the Jews. Hitler did not burn enough Jews—let's finish the job.' " *(D. Comp.* Nov. 21). Most instructive in the situation was the policy of the mayor and of the chief of police of Chicago, the second largest city in the United States. "The mob was so highly organized that it spotted 'outsiders' immediately. Several were badly beaten in plain sight of police, but no action was taken . . . Delegations to Mayor Kennelly, Police Commissioner Prendergast on Wednesday and Friday failed to obtain commitments that the mobs would be dispersed . . . When a *Chicago Daily News* reporter was threatened by hoodlums, he appealed for a police escort. He was refused." *(Ib.).* The Mayor, naturally, could not allow the little pogrom to go on indefinitely. "By Sunday, pressure on police and Mayor forced some enforcement of the law." *(Ib.).* A report by the American Civil Liberties Union, Chicago Division, stated: "Matters grow worse while officialdom watches . . . The talk of the crowd was primarily anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and to some extent anti-Communist, earlier in the evening. Later, the talk was almost totally anti-Semitic . . . Gangs of young hoodlums ran through the streets of the neighborhood searching out victims as they shouted their anti-Semitic filth." The leading editorial of the *Chicago Daily News* of November 16, 1949 gave an interesting detail of the affair: "A good many people were beaten. A policeman explained to one of our reporters that one batch were properly beaten because they

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

were Communists. 'How do you know they were Communists?' the reporter inquired. 'Because they are Jews,' the policeman explained." The Tsarist officials often blamed the victims of the pogromists for "provoking" pogroms. Quite interesting is the reported "verdict handed down by Chicago's Judge McGary when he charged the victims of the Peoria Street beatings with 'conspiracy.'" (J. Brainin, *Opinion*, Sept.-Oct. 1950, 16)

Thus, the creation of the Zionist State by Marxism and the bourgeoisie stimulated the further expansion of world anti-Semitism.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE MYTHICAL CRUCIFIXION OF THE LEGENDARY JESUS —THE CENTRAL FEATURE IN CHRISTIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

1. *Anti-Semitism in Christian Art and Church "Relics"*

THE HUMAN mind will more readily be influenced by ideas if they are supported with tangible illustrations. The Church recognized the truism that one picture is worth 10,000 words early in its history and enlisted art in its service. When Christianity had just issued from Judaism the Fathers of the Church had no image of "Christ" to utilize. The first representation of the mythical Christ was in the form of a fish. "One of the earliest symbols of the Savior, the fish . . ." *(Enc. Brit.* XXVI, 248); ". . . the symbolizing of Christ as a fish in the art of the catacombs, and in the literature of the 2nd century." *(Ib.* III, 367). The early Fathers regarded themselves as little fishes and Christ as a big fish. Tertullian wrote: "'We little fishes, after the example of our Fish Jesus Christ, are born in the water.'" *(Ib.)*. According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*—"From the third century on appears the fish, the symbol of Christ." (III, 42). But sooner or later, due to the nature of the foundation story of Christianity, Christ had to be represented in art not as a fish, or a lamb, or a lion, but pictured as a *man*. Naturally, the question of how Christ looked had been in the mind of the Christians even before the "fish" representation. The early Christian idea of the facial features of the mythical Jesus was not at all esthetic. It was assumed that in appearance he was "Without honour and unsightly" (Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* Cited in *Cath. Dict.* 156). But "A second and widely-different view of Christ's outward appearance began to gain ground after the triumph of the Church under Constantine." *(Cath. Dict.)*

When the Roman slaveholders lifted Christianity to the position of their State religion, the prelates anathemized the original "Fish" symbolization of Christ as heresy *(Enc. Brit.* III, 367). The inventive imagination of the Church servants produced legends about the existence of the impression of Christ's facial features. One such invention

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

was the "letter" of Lentulus to the Roman Senate describing in almost melodious words the face of "Jesus of Nazareth." Catholic sources eventually admitted the fraudulent nature of this story when they spoke of "A forged letter of 'Publius Lentulus' a friend of Pilate, addressed to the Roman Senate." *(Cath. Dict.* 158). "Veronica's veil" is a story of the following: "Veronica is said to have been one of the women who accompanied our Lord on his way to Calvary. She gave Him her veil that He might wipe away the perspiration from his face, and when our Lord had done so, the impress of his countenance was found upon the cloth." (157)

One legend said Christ had a red beard and blue eyes, others that he had a black beard and dark eyes. Artists produced thousands of imaginary faces and labelled them *Christ* and no two were exactly alike. Then they began to turn out various scenes from his supposed life as described in the New Testament. The invented images and life scenes of Christ only lead up to the focal feature, the scene of his *death*. The overall presentation is one of the human dignity and suffering of Christ and, conversely, of the utter depravity and beastly cruelty of the Jews who rejected him and caused him to suffer a terrible death on the cross.

Once Constantine had adopted Christianity (312) he decided that it needed some physical proof. So he sent his mother to Palestine to find the "Holy Cross" upon which the legendary Christ supposedly had been crucified about three centuries earlier. In connection with her mission a new accusation was pinned on the Jews. The charge now was that some Jews in Palestine knew exactly where the cross was buried but would not divulge this knowledge to the Christians:

"In the year 326 the mother of Constantine, Helena, then about 80 years old, having journeyed to Jerusalem, undertook to rid the Holy Sepulchre of the mound of earth heaped upon and around it, and to destroy the pagan buildings that profaned its site. Some revelations which she had received gave her confidence that she would discover the Savior's Tomb and His Cross. The work was carried on diligently, with the cooperation of St. Macarius, bishop of the city. The Jews had hidden the Cross in a ditch or well, and covered it over with stones, so that the faithful might not come and venerate it. Only a chosen few among the Jews knew the exact spot where it had been hidden, and one of them, named Judas, touched by Divine inspiration, pointed it out to the excavators, for which acts he was highly praised by St. Helena. Judas afterwards became a Christian saint, and is honoured under the name of Cyriacus. During the excavation three crosses were found, but because the *titulus* was detached from the Cross of Christ, there was no means of identifying it. Following an inspiration from on high, Macarius caused the three crosses to be carried, one after the other, to the bedside of a worthy woman who was at the point of death. The touch of the other two was of no avail; but on

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

touching that upon which Christ had died the woman got suddenly well again." *(Cath. Enc.* IV, 523)

This legend which the Church promulgates is in contradiction with another tale the Church also accepts that the discovery of the cross was made by Protonice, the wife of Claudius, during the reign of Tiberius. But the Church has never been nonplused by discrepancies in its mythology: "In recent times an attempt has been made to reconcile the two accounts, by attributing to St. Helena the rediscovery of the true cross, originally found by Protonice, and which had been buried again on the spot. A change was made in 1895 in the *Diario Romano,* when the word *Ritrovamento* was substituted for that of *Invenzione." (Enc. Brit.* VII, 506-7)

Eventually the pieces of wood of the supposed cross multiplied to such an extent that they were found in churches of almost every Christian country in the world. The Church said that the "Holy" wood had a miraculous force of vegetation. (Dupin, *Biblioteque Ecclesiastique,* III, 149)

Many other stage props were displayed by the Church, such as the "money" with which the "Jewish priests" bribed the mythical Apostle Judas. "Some of the pieces of silver that Judas received from the priests were also shown at Rome . . . Finally, the Redeemer's tears were exhibited in so many places that no one could doubt his being a man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief." (G. W. Foote, *Crimes of Christianity,* 93). "The blood of Christ was exhibited in more than a hundred places. Rochelle boasted that portion of the sacred fluid was caught in a glove by Nicodemus as the Savior hung on the cross." (p. 92). "At Turin is shown the linen sheet in which Joseph of Arimathea wrapt the body of Jesus." (95). The Christian leaders spread also the story that the very thorns that had been placed on the head of Christ had been found and that "it would seem that its twigs had been planted that they might grow again." (Calvin, *Traite Des Reliques,* 23; cited by Foote, 91). In the first centuries of Christianity, the cross itself, let alone the Crucifix, was never portrayed. "The early Christians, in spite of the importance they attached to the cross, refrained from reproducing it in their iconography." *(Enc. of Rel. and Ethics,* IV, 328)

The idea of placing the figure of Christ on the cross was not adopted until the legend of his facial image had sunk into the mind of the Christian population of the Roman Empire. "In the first four centuries, then, there is no conclusive evidence that Christians ever placed a figure on the cross. In the fifth century it became usual to put the figure of a lamb or even a bust of Christ on the cross . . ." *(Cath. Dict.* "Crucifix," 237-8). "It is well known, what a long and significant evolution the treatment of the subject of the Crucifixion underwent in thirteenth century Italian painting: how the traditional type of Christ, triumphant over death on the cross, erect and with open eyes, was succeeded by one, laying stress on the suffering of Christ,

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

henceforth represented with his eyes closed, and with the contour of his body making a curve, which as the century proceeds becomes more and more marked." *(The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs,* XXXIX, July-Dec. 1921)

From the time Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire through Feudalism and down to modern Capitalism the Church has employed the greatest artists and craftsmen to immortalize the invented images of Christ and particularly the part of the story connected with his death. "Gold, silver, bronze, and all the baser metals; ivory, common bone; the finest marbles, and the coarsest sandstone; wood, plaster, and clay, have all been employed with greater or less effect to depict the sufferings of Christ. Depending largely on the senses for the inculcation of truth, the Roman Catholics have exhausted high art in their efforts to produce impression. Every household has one or more crucifixes. No individual member is complete in his panoply of devotion without one. No church would be a church without a high altar and the figure of the Saviour stretched upon the cross." *(The Crucifixion as Illustrated in the Drama, Sculpture, Painting, Music, Poetry, and Eloquence,* 12)

A great deal of Christian art is in the churches but much of it is in art galleries, art museums and private collections. In January 1950, the New York Metropolitan Museaum of Art had a special exhibition of Middle Ages paintings and the list read as though it were a compilation of achievement of the Church in the art field. There was "The Crucifixion" by Bartolo di Fredi, "The Crucified Christ" of the Workshop of Baronzio, "The Crucifixion" of the Workshop of Masolino, "The Crucifixion" of the Workshop of Duccio, "The Crucifixion" of the Workshop of Bernardo Daddi, "The Crucifixion" by Fra Angelico, and many others, all with the gory details of bleeding hands and feet punctured with nails. Objectively, the entire museum, the largest of its kind in the United States, fairly reeks with Christian Defamation.

It is to be noted that the central theme in Christian art is the Crucifixion because the Church deliberately put special stress on this theme. "It has been sought in all ages of the Christian Church to reproduce the scenes of the Crucifixion. Sacred drama in scenic representations, sculpture, painting, sacred poetry, sacred music, sacred rhetoric—all have lent their highest conceptions, to make impressions through the senses on the emotional nature of man, by depicting the last hours and suffering of our Lord upon the cross." *(The Crucifixion* etc. 9). And the Church has succeeded in making its "impressions on the emotional nature of man." Its art, drama, literature and music have been thoroughly absorbed by its adherents. They need only one element to release their emotions—a verbal trigger to set off the charge. And this too the Church has been able and even anxious to supply. Here is a description of the effect one fiery preacher's discourse on the Crucifixion had on a listener: "He then drew a picture of the sufferings of our Saviour—his trial before Pilate, his ascent up Calvary,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his Crucifixion, and his death . . . His peculiar phrases had that force of description that the original scene appeared at that moment acting before our eyes. We saw the very faces of the Jews—the staring, frightful distortions of malice and rage. We saw the buffet; my soul kindled with a flame of indignation, and my hands were involuntarily and convulsively clenched." (William Wirt. Cited in *Crucifixion* etc. 22)

Such settings work up an atmosphere for a pogrom; and Christian ideologists hold that the Jewish Scapegoat must be kept around so that the faithful can behold with their eyes "the crucifiers of our Lord": "The perfidious Jews should be allowed to live among Christians as the form of the Lord's cross is painted in the Church of Christ, viz. for the continual and most helpful remembrance by all faithful of our Lord's Passion." (William of Newbury, *Historia Rerum Anglicarum*. Cited by Edward N. Calisch, in *The Jew in English Literature*, 51)

2. *The Anti-Semitic Power of the Passion Plays*

To beat up the contemporary Jew on the basis of the Ancient charge that the Jews crucified Jesus is quite a common procedure with hoodlums in Christian society. This fact is reflected in literature. One of Turgenev's characters asks a woman: "What do you mean they are beating him up? for what?" She replies: "Don't know little father. I suppose for a reason. And how could they not beat him, little father, for he killed Christ." *(End of Chertopkanov)*

The anti-Semitic aspect of the Crucifixion as presented on the stage has been traditionally used to arouse hatred against the Jews. In the drama of pre-Shakespeare England—"The Jewish characters of the Old Testament are pictured as normal human beings . . . But with the representations of the New Testament the whole atmosphere is changed. The Jews are no longer normal human beings. They are the accursed despisers, tormenters, and crucifiers of the Saviour . . . The scenes depicting the life and passion of Jesus were given with startling realism. They moved their spectators, and the actors themselves, to the profoundest depth of feeling. At times the actors fainted on the stage because of the intensity of emotion, and spectators lost their reason. This religious ecstasy could not fail to be turned into the bitterest hatred when it considered the people whom it held to be the cause of the 'divine tragedy.' Nor did the playwrights take any pains to minimize this effect. On the contrary it was heightened by the fact that the Jews were made conspicuous by their garb. Judas, as the arch-conspirator, the type of the race, was depicted with red hair and beard, and with a yellow garment . . . Then, too, every detail of the suffering of Jesus was given with exaggerated emphasis, till the tension at the crucifixion became well-nigh intolerable to the audience, standing open-mouthed and wide-eyed, drinking in every incident with quivering hearts stirred to profoundest sympathy." (E. N. Calisch, 54-55-56)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Spanish Dominican monks used the crucifix to incite people to kill the Jews in "revenge" for the suffering inflicted on the supposed founder of Christianity. "From every quarter Dominicans rushed forth with crucifixes in their hands, crying out, 'Revenge, revenge; down with the heretics; root them out; exterminate them.' A Jewish authority asserts that they offered to everyone who should murder a Jew that his sufferings in purgatory should be limited to a hundred days." (Milman, *History of the Jews,* 573. Cited by G. W. Foote, *Crimes of Christianity,* 165)

As we search through the *New Testament* we find that the death of Christ is mentioned at least 175 times; and the Church always sees to it that the people attending Christian religious services keep in mind the story of the Crucifixion. "On every Friday of the week a prayer is said in all churches beginning with the words, 'There was darkness when the Jews crucified our Lord Jesus.' " (J. S. Block, *Israel and the Nations,* xxvi-xxvii)

Passion plays are not the products of hooligan artists but of some of the world's greatest composers, Jewish included. Here is a portion from *Christus* by a famous composer, F. Mendelssohn–Bartholdy, a converted Jew: "Then unto them said Pilate, Take ye Him and crucify Him, for I cannot find a fault in Him. The Jews answering said: We have a sacred law, guilty by that law, let Him suffer! Then unto them he delivered Him, that they might crucify Him. They then took Jesus and straightway to Golgotha they led Him." Bach in *St. John's Passion* points to the Jews as instrumental in the arrest of Jesus which led to the Crucifixion: "The body of soldiers with their captain, who were sent by the Jews, laid hold of Jesus." (H. S. Drinker, *Texts of the Choral Wks. of Johann Sebastian Bach,* III, 418). Virtually every great composer produced a "passion" piece of music: Rubinstein, *Christus;* Gounod, *Redemption;* Handel, *Messiah.* The list of passion music pieces is a lengthy one.

In the United States passion plays have often been presented. One of these anti-Semitic performances was a motion picture *The King of Kings.* It was clearly calculated to arouse hatred against the Jews. "In his observations on 'The King of Kings' in *The Jewish Tribune,* Rabbi Rudolph Coffee states: 'During the cruicifixion scene, I heard a woman say to the man next to her: "I never want to sit next to a Jew again." ' " (M. Huntenberg, *Jesus, The Crucified Jew,* 114). And as in all the other fields of Defamation so in the production of passion plays some Jews have contributed their services. Thus, two Jewish producers, Gest and Belasco, staged the Crucifixion scene in New York's Hippodrome: *"Passion Play in Gest Production Revives Ancient Religious Prejudice . . . Christian Clergy Silent as Jewish Press Continues Protest.* The expected intervention of the New York District Attorney on the basis of Section 2074 of the New York Penal Law, prohibiting the personification of the Deity of any religion, to prevent the presentation of the Freiburg Passion Play at the Hippodrome, did not mate-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

rialize and the production, sponsored by Morris Gest and David Belasco, is proceeding since the opening on Monday night . . . The Passion Play as presented by the Freiburg players at the Hippodrome is distinctly a heightened version of the ancient charges which gave rise to the cry of 'Christ killers.' It is distinctly anti-Jewish, without any redeeming feature. It follows closely the Gospel according to St. John, the least historically correct and the one Gospel which is self-evidently directed toward accusing the Jews of that time . . . The founder of Christianity and the apostles are portrayed as blond in contrast to the priests and the people who are thoroughly brunette. Judas, of course, is the blackest of the black . . . The crucifixion scene is prolonged to an unbearable extent. Every detail has been elaborated upon with a stark reality that cannot claim the excuse of art. The hammering of the nails resounds through the huge hall on the ears of a 6,000 strong audience. While the Jewish press of New York City unanimously condemns the presentation and sharply criticizes Messrs. Gest and Belasco, the metropolitan press pay no attention to these protests . . . The 'Day' quoted a statement by Mr. Marschall . . . 'Naturally we Jews feel it most, since the Gests are, to our pain and shame, ours.'" *(J. D. B.* May 3, 1929)

Some dramatic presentations of the Crucifixion through clever devices make the spectators feel keenly the presence of the "murderers of the Savior." Thus: "In the Frankfort Passion Play the Jews who mock and strike Jesus bear names current in that vicinity until today." (J. Trachtenberg, *The Devil and the Jews,* 13)

Hitler grasped the explosive anti-Jewish force inherent in the presentation of the Crucifixion: "Chancellor Hitler in recent announcements lent his support to the Passion Players and hinted that not only would he support them financially, but wanted them to go on a tour of Germany for the first time in their history, so that the whole country could be inflamed against the Jews." *(J. D. B.* Aug. 6, 1933)

An audience presented with a Crucifixion performance views the cross not otherwise than as a symbol of the mythical crime of the Jews. And in the Gentile world, "No symbol, either in art or in religion, is so universal as the cross. It appears twice in our alphabet, as the letter T and the letter X. It is worn by priests on their sacrificial robes, by distinguished laymen as a sign of distinction on occasions of State, and by male and female nonentities as taste may direct." (W. S. Walsh, *Curiosities of Popular Customs,* 297). On the other hand, from the aspect of the history of the Jewish Scapegoat, the cross is a symbol of the worst massacres of the Jews. The Crusaders used the Latin cross. Hitler used the swastica which is the gammate cross. The name of G. L. K. Smith's American pogromist newspaper is *The Cross and Flag.*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3. *Samples of Anti-Semitic Use of the Crucifixion Theme by the Church, in Literature and Politics*

In Feudal Society the undisguised application of the Crucifixion theme for the purpose of inflaming pogrom mobs was fairly common. The heaviest toll of the classical Scapegoat blood on the basis of this accusation was taken during the Crusades. "The deep religious emotions aroused by the Crusades from the 12th century onward stimulated terrifying results in relation to the Jew, which influence the emotions even to this day. The ancient charge that the Jews were responsible for the death of the Christian Savior prompted the war cry of the Crusaders that the Jews must perish. The consequence was large-scale massacres of entire Jewish communities throughout Europe." (Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, *Questions and Answers Concerning the Jew,* Question A. Appendix XII). "According to the contemporary Jewish records, the cross-bearers 'as they approached a city where Jews dwelt, said to one another, we are going on a far journey to seek the Holy Sepulcher and wreak vengeance on the infidels who possess it; and, behold! right among us live the Jews, whose fathers crucified our Lord; let us, therefore, revenge ourselves on them first of all . . .' " (M. Lowenthal, 42)

Even when the popes would adopt a policy of halting the slaughter, they would still insert in their official statements the Crucifixion charge against the Jews: "So the blessed Gregory forbade the killing of Jews, pronouncing it impious to wish to slay those whom God had preserved in order that, after the loss of their country and their liberty, they might, in lasting penance for the wrong done by their fathers in shedding the Savior's blood, live dispersed throughout the world." (Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages,* VI, 327). Pope Innocent III (1215) put the policy in these words: "As Cain was a wanderer and an outcast, not to be killed by anyone but marked with the sign of fear on his forehead, so the Jews—against whom the voice of the blood of Christ cries out—although they are not to be killed, must always be dispersed as the wanderers upon the face of the earth." (Migne, *Patrologia,* CCXV, 1291)

A thousand different legends directed against the Jews and revolving around the Crucifixion theme have been invented in the course of more than nineteen centuries. One of the most common is the legend of the "Wandering Jew." This story symbolically refers to the entire Jewish group in the Diaspora: "*Wandering Jew.* In a widespread medieval legend, locally surviving, a Jew (named Joannes Buttadeus) who treated Christ contempetuously, on His way to crucifixion, and was condemned by Him to wander upon the earth until the Second Advent. According to another account the Jew's name was Cartaphilus. He is the subject of several novels, as *Le Juif Errant* (1844) by Eugene Sue, and *Salathiel* (1829) by George Croly." *(Webster's* 2870). A more detailed definition is given in E. C. Brewer's

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. One of the details says that *The Wandering Jew* "is said to be a Jew who would not suffer Jesus to drink from a horse-trough, but pointed out to Him some water in a hoof-print, and bade Him go there and drink." (681)

The phrase *Wandering Jew* is applied in various ways, as a rule opprobriously: "Harry Main is the Wandering Jew of Ipswich, around whom darkly hangs the shadow of an unpardonable crime and its fearful doom." (B. A. Botkin, *A Treasure of New Folklore,* 324)

The popes in the epoch of modern Capitalism have been making use of the old pogromist theme of Crucifixion by ordering the reprinting of the overtly anti-Semitic Church writings. A case in point is the "teachings" of Thomas Aquinas, one of the most celebrated authorities of the Church who lived during the last three Crusades. Aquinas deepened the anti-Semitic poison of the Crucifixion. His trick was that since the Jewish prophets, held by the Jews themselves as seers who had an extraordinary spiritual insight, foretold the coming of "Christ" and revealed the signs by which he would be known, the Crucifixion of Jesus was the more horrible crime of the Jews because of their consciousness of the character of their victim. The term "objection" Aquinas uses means *accusation:*

"Whether Christ's Persecutors knew Who He Was? *Objection I.* It seems that Christ's persecutors did know who He was. For it is written (Matth. XXI. 38) that the husbandmen seeing the son said within themselves: *This is the heir; come, let us kill him* . . . The Jews therefore sinned, as Crucifiers not only of the Man-Christ, but also as of God." *(Summa Theologica,* III, art. V, 305-6)

Aquinas extended his accusation to the Jewish masses but exonerated the Romans: "The rulers of the Jews knew that He was the Christ: and if there was any ignorance in them, it was affected ignorance, which could not excuse them . . . The Jews also of the common order sinned most grievously . . . But the sin of the Gentiles, by whose hands He was crucified, was much more excusable, since they had no knowledge of the Law . . . Christ, indeed, willed His Passion just as the Father willed it; yet He did not will the Unjust action of the Jews." (III, art. VI. 309-310)

Christianity has carried this piece of "Passion" Defamation for eight hundred years which have been marked with hounding and butchering of the Jews during the Inquisition and in the course of other bloody Christian events.

Pope Leo XIII, who, in the period when the flame of the anti-Dreyfus "Jewish Peril" passions was burning furiously, declared, "The Jews require no protection against the people, who have a hard struggle against the preponderance of the Jews" (Cited in *Jewish Chronicle,* Feb. 26, 1897), and who lived to witness Kishinev, gave special orders to spread the "teachings" of that great pogrom inspirer, Aquinas. "Leo XIII points out the benefits to be derived from 'a practical reform of philosophy by restoring the renowned teachings of St. Thomas

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Aquinas.' He exhorts the bishops to 'restore the golden wisdom of Thomas and to spread it far and wide for the defence and beauty of the Catholic Faith, for the good of society, and for the advantage of all the sciences.' " *(Cath. Enc.* XIV, 673, 3)

It was the story of the Crucifixion that was responsible for the Defamation that all Jews were traitors. In 1897, during the anti-Dreyfus pogrom agitation in France, Peter Constant, doctor of Theology, in his work *Les juifs devant l'Eglise et l'historie* declared: "Ever since the great betrayal of Mount Calvary the spirit of Iscariot has infested the Jewish race. In the heart of every Jew flows a traitor's blood."

The Catholic Church is the historical fountainhead of the Crucifixion anti-Jewish poison which is poured freely by the servants of the Church through a great variety of channels: "Thus God, the Almighty, turned even the murder of our Saviour by the Jews to the salvation of the world, and the impertinence of the same Jews to the conversion of the heathens." (Rev. Joseph Deharbe, *A Catechism of the Catholic Religion,* 62, ed. Rev. P. N. Lynch, D.D. Bishop of Charleston). "So, too, the Jews mocked at the humiliation of Christ as he hung upon the Cross, and God's curse was swift to overtake them." (Rev. Ch. Hart, *A Shorter Bible History for the Use of Catholic Students,* 8). "Thus was completed the Old Testament, or the Covenant God had made with an unmindful and ungrateful people (the Jews); they rejected and cruelly put to death the Redeemer of all mankind." (Cardinal Gasparri, *The Catholic Catechism)*

The Catholic Church is far from being alone in this work. With respect to the anti-Jewish theme, *all* Christian denominations are of a piece because of their common anti-Semitic root residing in the Crucifixion. Here is an example from the Friends whose basic teachings are not particularly friendly to the Jews: "What said the Saviour to the Jews, when he told them, I would have gathered you but ye would not. It did not suit their interest, and passions, and lust . . . Because he might have continued to be an instructor, and his mission on earth might have been prolonged, if the cruel Jews had not cut short the time." *(The Quaker or a Series of Sermons by Elias Hicks,* 54, 216). And here are Mormon Crucifixion arrows against the Jews: "And then shall the Jews look upon me, and say, What are these wounds in thine hands, and in thy feet? Then shall they know that I am the Lord; for I will say unto them, These wounds, are the wounds with which I was wounded in the house of my friends. I am he who was lifted up. I am Jesus that was crucified. I am the Son of God. And then shall they weep because of their iniquities; then shall they lament because they persecuted their King." *(Book of Commandments,* "A Revelation to the church, given in Kirtland, Ohio, March 1831")

The pogrom incitement intrinsic in the theme of the Crucifixion, accumulated in the course of many centuries, is being transmitted into the mind of Christian society through the media of many of the most respected men and women of this society.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Benjamin Franklin, United States diplomat and the outstanding American scientist of his days, wrote "A Comparison of the Conduct of the Ancient Jews and of the anti-Federalists in the United States of America." In it he brought in the story about the Jewish populace demanding the crucifixion of Jesus: "So, excited by their High Priests and Scribes, they exclaimed against the Messiah, that he aim'd at becoming King of the Jews, and cry'd out, *'Crucify him, Crucify him!'* " *(The Writings of Benj. Franklin,* Macmillan, IX, 702)

John Milton, famous English poet, counterposed the motive of Pilate which was not against Christ to that of the Jews who cried for the blood of Christ out of vengeance: "Thus also in the crucifixion of Christ the sole aim of Pilate was to preserve the favor of Caesar; that of the Jews to satisfy their own hatred and vengeance." ("The Christian Doctrine," *The Student's Milton,* 983)

Harriet Beecher Stowe wrote in connection with the Crucifixion: "Here is the Jewish nation, a proud and once powerful people, crushed and writhing under the heel of the conquering Romans. They are burning with hatred of their oppressors and with a desire of revenge, longing for a Messiah that shall lead them to conquest and make their nation the head of the world. And now, here comes this Jesus and professes to be the long-promised leader; and what does he teach? Love and forgiveness of enemies . . . They are to love their bitterest enemies, pity and pray for them . . . It must have inflamed these haughty, ambitious leaders to fury to see all their brilliant visions of war and conquest and national independence melting away in a mist of what seemed to them the mere impossible sentimentalism of love . . . And so, on the altar of patriotism this murder was laid as a sacrifice. And it was this same burning, impatient national spirit of independence that slew Christ which afterwards provoked the Roman government beyond endurance, and brought upon Jerusalem wrath to the uttermost . . . The decision to reject Christ was the decision which destroyed Jerusalem . . ." *(Footsteps of the Master,* 249, 250, 251)

A German philosopher, Arthur Schopenhauer, declared that the Jews were forever branded as the murderers of Christ: "Having committed a deadly sin against the Messiah, the world's Savior, they not only will never be relieved of the burden of this crime but will remain an eternal wanderer without a fatherland among strangers nations. Such is the crime and such is the fate of this little nation." (Cited by Shmakov in *Jewish Speeches,* R. 85)

Victor Hugo called the Jews "a people God-murderer" *(Literature et Philosophie Me'l'ees)*

Francois Rene Chateaubriand absolved the Christian anti-Semites and pogromists on the "ground" that the Jews themselves sanctioned their own persecution for murdering the mythical Christian messiah: "The people had cried out—'His blood be upon us and upon our children'—God listened to this vow of the Jews . . . and answered their

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

prayer." *(Intineraire de Paris a Jerusalem,* II, 17. Cited by Malcolm Hay in *The Foot of Pride,* 327-8)

Pierre Leroux, a Left bourgeois republican, who won respect from the Paris Commune, wrote: "Whence comes, in the Jew, this frenzied attachment for the goods of this earth, an attachment which has made his name a synonym for greed and avarice and which renders useless, for the people as a whole, the very blessing of its revelation? Shall we say with the theologians that by a terrible predestination, it has deserved to fail to recognize its Savior and Messiah, the Savior of all men, since it failed indeed to recognize Him and stupidly put Him to death? No doubt." ("Les Juifs, rois de l'epoque," *Malthus et les economistes.* Cited by E. Silberner, *J. Soc. St.* Oct. 1950, 370)

The flame of hatred against the Jews through the use of the theme of Crucifixion has been fanned in reference books: "The immediate cause of Christ's death was the animosity of the Jews with whom our Lord was brought into collision through His teachings, His ministry, and His claims." *(Dict. of the Apostolic Church,* I, 267-8). "To the Jews of all parties, Pharisees, Sadducees and Herodians, this was blasphemy, a crime deserving of death, and to bring about that end became their burning and relentless desire." *(National Enc.* V, "Jesus," 590)

"During a recent outbreak of anti-Semitic violence in Boston the following words were uttered from a Christian pulpit. 'The Jews killed our Lord and the curse of God has fallen upon them. They said, "His blood be upon our heads" and it was. By God's will they were destined to wander over the face of the earth as strangers among strangers, despised and persecuted; and so until the end of time, for the Jews killed our Lord and God's curse rests upon them.' These identical words are found repeated again and again in Christian textbooks now in use. The Research Department of the Textbook Commission has prepared a preliminary report consisting of eleven legal typewritten pages of such quotations from various Christian textbooks. They are fully documented. The quotations are represented, not alone of what is *read,* but equally of what is *said* in thousands of Christian institutions including churches, Sunday schools, parochial, public schools and seminaries." ("Anti-Semitism is a Christian Sin," by Rev. W. Ellis Davies, *The Protestant,* May 1944, 23)

Many other Christian writers and clergymen cite the Crucifixion anti-Jewish aspect of Church textbooks. Thus:

"A catechism entitled 'Manual of Christian Doctrine' published by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, pursues the same theme. I cite just one of numerous examples:

" 'Q. How far was the hatred of the Jews appeased by the crucifixion of Jesus?'

" 'A. The Jews were ill satisfied with their brutal triumph, for they pursued their victim, even in his last moments, heaping injury and insults upon Him, and turning in derision His name, His royalty,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

His words and miracles.' (p. 95)." *("Poisoned Textbooks,"* by Lawrence Fernsworth, *Ib.* Oct.-Nov. 1946, 52)

Many respectable dictionaries contain reference to the responsibility for the mythical Crucifixion allegedly assumed by the Jews. Thus: *"Blood . . .* Bloodguiltiness. His blood be on us, and on our children. Matt. XXVII. 25." *(Webster's,* 291)

English poet laureate, John Masefield, in *The Trial of Jesus* makes Jesus say: "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews . . ." (62). The Chorus in this Crucifixion play also points at the Jews: "Now as we sing, the Roman soldiers gather to their court, to hear the charge the Jews prefer." (115)

Robert Ingersoll, popularly believed to have held "anti-Christian views" *(Enc. Brit.,* XIV, 564), gave vigor and Christian vitality to the anti-Semitism in the Crucifixion legend: "The Jews were the only people to whom Jehova made his will directly known. Were they better than other nations? They read the Old Testament and one of the effects of such reading was, that they crucified a kind, loving and perfectly innocent man . . ." ("Some Reasons Why" II, 330). Whereas the Church has been preaching all through the Dark Ages and into the modern times the fantastic tale that the Ancient Jews killed a divine being who appeared in the form of a man and bore the name of Jesus, Ingersoll in a sense presented a blacker anti-Semitic picture than did the Church. Advanced elements in society would not accept the story of a murder of a god who is pictured by the priests as having performed all sorts of miracles, but they would accept the Crucifixion as the murder of "a kind, loving and perfectly innocent man." And the reasons Ingersoll gave for the invented black-hearted atrocity of which the Jews are accused is "The life and death of Christ do not constitute an atonement. They are worth the example, the moral force, the heroism of benevolence, and in so far as the life of Christ produces emulation in the direction of goodness, it has been of value to mankind . . . if the Jews had been a civilized people when Christ appeared—a people who had not been hardened by the laws of Jehova—they would not have crucified Christ . . ." (315-316, 317)

A few passages from Dickens' *The Life of Our Lord* illustrate the work of novelists in the realm of Crucifixion pogrom incitement:

"Our Saviour said to him, 'take up thy bed and go away.' And he went away quite well. Many Jews saw this; and when they saw it, they hated Jesus Christ the more; knowing that the people, being taught and cured by him, would not believe their Priests, who told the people what was not true, and deceived them. So they said to one another that Jesus Christ should be killed, because he cured people on the Sabbath Day (which was against their strict law) and because he called himself the Son of God. And they tried to raise enemies against Him, and to get the crowd in the streets to murder Him."

Dickens made it clear that Pilate was not a Jew to emphasize the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

alleged wickedness of the Jewish nation: "Jesus was taken from the High Priests to the Judgment Hall where Pontius Pilate, the Governor, sat, to administer justice. Pilate (who was not a Jew) said to Him 'Your own nation, the Jews, and your own Priests have delivered you to me. What have you done?' Finding that he had done no harm, Pilate went out and told the Jews so."

In the following passage Dickens pictured a crowd of Jews crying for Jesus' blood: " 'Behold the man!' They cried out, savagely, 'Crucify Him! Crucify Him!' So did the chief priests and the officers. 'Take Him and crucify Him yourselves,' said Pilate. 'I find no fault in Him.' But they cried out, 'He called Himself the Son of God; and that by the Jewish law, is death! And He called himself King of the Jews; and that is against the Roman law, for we have no King but Caesar, who is the Roman Emperor. If you let him go, you are not Caesar's friend. Crucify Him! Crucify Him!' When Pilate saw that he could not prevail with them, however hard he tried, he called for water, and, washing his hands before the crowd, said, 'I am innocent of the blood of this just person.' Then he delivered Him to them to be crucified; and they, shouting and gathering round Him, and treating Him (who still prayed for them to God) with cruelty and insult, took Him away."

J. H. Hammond, Governor of South Carolina (1844), told the American Jews that they inherited "the same scorn for Jesus Christ which instigated their ancestors to crucify him . . ." (Cited by M. U. Schappes in *Doc. Hist. of Jews in U. S.* 242)

General Ebenezer Dumont said to a Jew at Mildraugh's Hill, Kentucky in 1861: "If it hadn't been for just such damned cusses as you, our Lord Jesus Christ would be alive and well to this day." (Cited by H. L. Mencken, *A Dict. of Quot.* 613)

The Crucifixion charge against the Jews has been used in politics at one time or another almost in all the countries of Christendom, from the blackest autocrats to the most Liberal democracies. In Tsarist Russia—"When Alexander III was shown the draft of an official report recommending some relaxation of the oppression from which the Jews of his empire were suffering, he noted in the margin: 'But we must not forget that the Jews crucified Christ.' " (Malcolm Hay, *The Foot of Pride*, 19)

In American politics the Crucifixion theme came to the surface more than once. "The public charge of 'Christ-killers' was made in 1747 in a close election to the New York colonial legislature." (Schappes, *Masses and Mainstream*, Oct. 1948, 49)

William Jennings Bryan's famous "Cross of Gold Speech" (Democratic Convention, Chicago, 1896), regarded by the Christian bourgeoisie as a magnificent piece of oratory, ended with a clear allusion to the torture of Jesus: "You shall not press down upon the brow of Labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold." These words evoked in the Christians the vision of the Jews "Christ-killers" and by a slight twist of mind Bryan supporters

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

injected the Crucifixion theme in their attack on their political opponents:

"During the Chicago convention swarms of the Populists circulated through the hotels shouting: 'Down with gold! . . . Down with the Christ-killing gold-bugs!' "

"In Ohio, one of the apostles of this new crusade is Allan O. Meyers . . . As a sample of O. Meyers' arguments in inducing people to vote for Bryan we quote the following: 'These curlyheaded Jews of New York own all the gold, and they want to do to you like Joseph of old did, to gather up everything and then strangle the farmers. These Jews who killed our Christ,' etc.

"The National Democratic Executive Committee is sanctioning this course of their speakers by their silence." *(Am. Is.* Oct. 1, 1896)

And while Bryan's political machine apparently gave tacit approval to the anti-Semitic campaign of the more outspoken voices in Bryan's camp, some Jewish elements attempted to whitewash Bryan, the factual leader of the Democratic Party, who had set the subtle tune to this campaign: "The orator who spoke the impressive peroration about the crucifixion of American industry upon a cross of gold, was using a striking and brilliant figure of speech, which he himself recognized as a figure of speech, and meant only as such. But the metaphor carried with it a subtle insinuation." *(Jewish Chronicle,* Nov. 6, 1896)

4. *The Inability of the Jewish Bourgeoisie to Meet the Crucifixion Pogrom Incitement*

For nearly two thousand years, before and particularly after Christianity became the State religion of the Roman slaveholders, the Jewish Scapegoat has stood helpless before the official Christian charge of having destroyed the supposed founder of Christianity. All attempts of the Jewish bourgeois leaders to free the Jews from this charge has proved futile. In the course of centuries the spokesmen of the Jews sought to reason with the ruling Christian powers that even if it were true that a Jewish court condemned Jesus to death, it was false and iniquitous to put the blame on all the succeeding Jewish generations. Some Jews advanced slightly different arguments. "In order to be left in peace by the Christians, the Jews of Spain invented a fable and pretended that they had come to the country long before the death of Christ and that they were therefore not guilty of the Savior's death." (Coudenhove-Kalergi, *Anti-Semitism Throughout the Ages,* 128-9)

A striking illustration of the *consciousness* of the active anti-Semitic forces in their use of the Crucifixion story as a point in the policy of maintaining the Jews as the only fundamental social-political Scapegoat, is the case of the Karaite Jews. These Jews although of an infinitely less mixed descent ethnologically do not essentially differ from the "regular" Jews. For a while the Tsarists persecuted the Karaite

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sect. But the removal of the stigma of Crucifixion from these Jews, *with the Government's aid,* excluded them from persecution—despite the fact that the "proof" furnished by these Jews was a crude falsification:

"The most eminent Karaite figure of the 19th Cent., however, is Abraham Firkovitch (Firkowitsch), who was commissioned by Simhah Bobovich, the wealthy and influential leader of the Crimean Karaites, to compile a memorandum to the Russian authorities showing that the Karaites professed the true Biblical religion anterior to Rabbinism, and that, having had nothing to do with the Talmudic tradition, could not have had any share in the guilt for the crucifixion of Jesus. Firkovich's memorandum was completely successful in its purpose, and procured for the Karaites equal rights with Christian citizens of Russia, liberating them from the crushing burden of civil disabilities affecting the rabbinic Jews . . . while his startling quasi-discoveries of alleged pre-Christian Karaite settlements in Russia were at first believed, later research discredited them completely." *(Univ. J. Enc.* VI, 317)

The "regular" Jews, whether religious or not, must bear the stigma to the end of anti-Semitism. Revealingly enough, the drunken, maddened mobs of the pogromists in 1905 avoided attacking the Karaite Jews.

Some of the leading figures among the Jewish bourgeoisie, in an impasse, have sought to evade the accusation by means of humor. Cremieux, a Jewish member of the Provisional Government of France in 1848, member of the Trochu-Thiers regime, and founder and President of the Universal Israelite Alliance, found no other recourse than a wise-crack in his attempt to overcome the devastating force generated by the rendering of the Crucifixion in art: "In order to do away with this affair we allow you to kill our God as well when you meet him." (Cited by H. Kosmala in *The Jew in the Christian World,* 53). This was an admission of the futility of struggling against the accusation and in essence was support to the Crucifixion theme.

Some Jews attempt to lend a Jewish religious aspect to the anti-Semitic essence of the Crucifixion. The well-known French Jewish artist Marc Chagal in his painting "The Crucifixion" presents Jesus as a Hassidic rabbi wrapped in a Jewish prayer-shawl. Others, however, have been repeating the pleas or protests voiced for generations. In vain. The charge must stand as long as Christianity does, for it constitutes the cornerstone of the Christ mythology. Here is a record of some of the hopeless protests:

"That Christian ministers should stop teaching children in the Sunday schools that the Jews are responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus is demanded in a recent letter to the London 'Jewish Chronicle' by D. G. Baker, who notes with disappointment that at the recent conference of Jews and Christians held in London for the purpose of bringing about a better understanding between the faiths the Christian

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ministers didn't give positive proof of their desire to establish good will.

" 'To detest the Jew is the first lesson the Christian child receives,' says the writer. 'His first lesson is at his mother's or nurse's knee; he is there taught that God came down on earth and lived as a Man in order to save mankind, but that the wicked Jews killed him. When the child is a little older, he learns, at day-school and at Sunday-school, alleged details as to how Judas, the Jew, with all a Jew's avarice and greed for money, 'betrayed' the Lord for thirty pieces of silver, and delivered him into the hands of his enemies—the Jews, of course. The young child is supplied with minute particulars of the sufferings of his Lord and Saviour on the Cross. It follows, quite naturally, that the Christian child, having imbibed this teaching, finds his heart going out to the Jews in an ecstacy of love and goodwill! But the child is not taught that all this is about something or other that is supposed to have taken place nearly 2,000 years ago . . . is not taught that all the 'evidence' in support of the allegations consists merely of an unsigned, undated and anonymous writing, the authenticity of which is doubted even by eminent Churchmen." *(J. D. B.* Jan. 13, 1930)

"Because of its desire to keep a maximum number of Christians cooperating in the effort to develop a better spirit of brotherhood despite religious preconceptions, we can understand why the N.C.C.J. [National Conference of Christians and Jews] would not press too hard for the elimination of some of the texts from Christian teachings such as were quoted in the December issue of *The Jewish Forum,* or such as the following from the 'Bible History for Children' by a Catholic Teacher, published with Preface by Rev. A. F. Hickey, S.T.L., Diocesan: 'Why did the Jews demand the crucifixion of Jesus? First, doubtless, because it was the most cruel form of execution . . . But also because these "pious" Jews were so bitter in their hatred, that they were not satisfied to KILL Jesus, but intended to commit him to everlasting despair . . . All the (Jewish) people lightly assumed all the awful responsibility by shouting: "His blood be upon us and upon our children." '

"Children are instigated to reciprocal murder by *The Bible History* by the Rt. Rev. Richard Gilmour, D.D., published by Benzinger Bros., printers to the Holy Apostolic See, in the following manner: 'The murdered Abel is a figure of Jesus Christ, while Cain is a figure of the traitor Judas and the Jewish people, who put our Saviour to death.'

"Yet such texts negate all possible efforts toward Brotherhood between Christians and Jews wherever they are permitted to be taught or in any manner utilized. For all practical purposes, they are a continuous declaration of war against the Jews." *(Jewish Forum,* Feb. 1949, 21)

Not a few Jewish bourgeois leading figures capitulate to the Christian bourgeoisie to the point of intimating agreement that Jesus existed

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

historically and that he was turned over by the Jewish priests to Pilate for crucifixion, but are seeking to gain a point by arguing that it is only one Gospel, that of John, that makes the wholesale accusation against the Ancient Jews, while those of Mark, Matthew and Luke stress that it was only the Jewish priests who rejected Jesus. But the modern Defamers are wise to all the "clever" arguments of the Jewish bourgeoisie. In the mechanics of the Scapegoat role of the Jews, the anti-Semitic Crucifixion attack is leveled at the Ancient Jews primarily with the view to arousing pogrom sentiments against the *living* Scapegoat. A Christian Defamer writes: "If some excuse can be found for the Jews of our Lord's day, what can be said in favor of the Jew of today? The Jew of today has not only seen the fulfillment of all of their prophecies in Christ, but is very conscious of the fact that with Christ the communications of God to the Jewish people have come to an end. No prophet has arisen among them since the time of our Lord. Jehova has been silent to them for two thousand years . . . Their existence as a religious body would not be possible did not God sustain them for some very definite purpose. Part of that purpose is found in the fact that their continued existence serves as telling testimony both to the truth of Christianity and to the truthfulness of their own prophets." (Rev. Richard Felix, *The Apostle's Creed,* 50-51. 1935)

Of course, neither the Christian nor the Jewish priests at any time in the past two thousand years ever understood that the people called "Jews" have been sustained as a social-political Scapegoat by the ruling Western powers, first by pagan than by Christian, and that these powers have usually been aided in this task by the unenlightened Jews themselves—and often by enlightened ones.

One Jewish bourgeois writer presents demands to the Christian world: "I demand that you cease indoctrinating the tender minds of your children with the false accusation against the Jews that they were instrumental in causing the crucifixion of Jesus. I demand that you cease inciting your followers against the Jews with your Passion Plays before the approach of Easter. I demand in the name of justice that you begin now to right the deadly wrong committed against the Jews, by revising those chapters in the Four Gospels that tell of the trial of Jesus, and by deleting from the New Testament texts all accusations against the Jews." (H. E. Goldin, *The Case of Nazarene Reopened,* "A Challenge")

The sincere bourgeois ideologists, Jews and Gentiles, fail to see that asking the Church to repudiate the charge is tantamount to a request that the Church reject and renounce its own mythological foundations and the entire mass of "relics," documents, books, artistic representations of Christ, in a word, they don't see that for the Church to repudiate the Crucifixion theme would be tantamount to signing its own death warrant and repudiating Christian dogma and culture.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE MARXIST SYSTEM APPLYING LEFT CHRISTIANISM

1. *American and British Socialist Contributions to the Christ Myth*

THE COMPLEX Marxist system of ideas and politics contains not only anti-Semitism of the non-Christian nature but also *Christian* anti-Semitism. For many decades American Marxists have fought a winning battle to sustain the Christ legend in some form among the advanced workers and intellectuals. They have even contributed to the monstrous crucifixion pogrom incitement. Usually the contributions have been couched in "revolutionary" phrases to endow the Christ legend with a supposedly new meaning. Here is an example in which the Marxists confirm the Crucifixion charge against the Jews but stress redeeming features which make that invented crime of the Jews excusable: "That the Jews killed Christ is the principal thing that many excellent Christians remember about that extraordinary race. They forget that that race also gave birth to Christ. That Christ should be killed by any people among whom he might appear was inevitable, and had to do with human nature at large. The exceptional and marvelous thing, speaking secularly, was his production." (*American Socialist,* Jan. 25, 1877, 29)

An American Socialist classic of Christian Defamation is the *Ancient Lowly* (1888), a pseudo-scientific Left-Christian work by C. Osborne Ward. Although in the preface Ward asserted that a wing of Marxism rejected Christianity yet he made the following statement: "The author may sum up these prefatory remarks with a word on the general lesson taught by this volume . . . that the present movement whose most radical wing loudly disclaims Christianity, is nevertheless building exactly upon the precepts of that faith, as it was told to us and taught us by Jesus Christ." (I, viii-x)

To bring the mythical Jesus close to the heart of the Marxist workers, Ward asserted reassuringly that his own story was vastly different from that of the Church: "Jesus, a tradesman, messiah and prophet, coming just one hundred years after Spartacus, was obliged to labor and struggle during the greater part of his lifetime, to support himself, father, mother, brothers and sisters. Ministers of his Gospel, who preach it from any other standpoint, do so only because they have been imposed upon by the ruling of prelates who, since Constantine's political amalgamation with neo-Platonism which upheld both chattel and wage-slavery and was no ingredient of the original precept, forsook the master and backslid into paganism." (I, 508). Ward leads the reader, by devious ways, to the anti-Semitic Crucifixion climax of this fairy tale. "That he lived, is true beyond cavil; and the Jew does not deny it; he only denies that he was the great aristocrat whom his own proud race expected. Here lies the trouble. Let it be remembered that those ancient Jews of whom we read, were at this time very proud people and they had no sympathy whatever with persons who would stoop

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

to an agitation in the cause of the slaves, or the working classes. This phase of the life and labors of Jesus, they were themselves the very first to condemn and reject. It was they who were maddened at his work, and they who betrayed and killed him." (I, 522). Ward accepts the story in the *New Testament* that technically it was the Roman governor who specifically ordered the alleged Crucifixion. And he adds a distinct note of instigation against the Jews: "Nevertheless Pilate was afraid of the Jews, who were in a foment of insurrection, demanding the immediate death of the prisoner. He had not the determination of the occasion. He gave way to their importunities, signed the death warrant and took the consequences." (II, 391)

Then Ward supports the anti-Semitic story about deacon Stephen, the so-called first Christian martyr: "It is under these circumstances, far more economical than religious, that we find Stephen attacked by a mob of Jews . . . With a mad rush they seized the young deacon, dragged him into the suburbs of the city, and after the abuse they were able, in their exasperation, to heap upon him, seized stones and hurled them in tempestuous hail, breaking his bones and tearing his flesh with their cutting angles and swift flight till death rescued him from a sense of their furious rage." (II, 402-403, 404, 405)

Ward's anti-Semitic Left Christian work went through several editions. In a note to the fourth edition, dated January 1907, its publishers say: "Now, nearly twenty years after the first publication of the book, its publication has been taken over by a cooperative publishing house owned by sixteen hundred socialist clubs and individual socialists. A systematic effort will now for the first time be made to give this author's works the wide circulation they deserve." And for decades the Marxist leadership of the American Socialist movement has been disseminating Ward's Left Christian anti-Semitism.

American Socialist references to Christ as a true historical figure have not been confined to Ward. Daniel De Leon, the founder of the Socialist Labor Party in the United States, linked Socialism with Jesus: ". . . Socialism, with the Nazarene, spurns as futile, if not wicked, the method of cajolery and seduction . . ." *(Reform or Revolution,* 11). The mythical founder of Christianity was adopted by American Socialists: "From time to time there are outcries concerning the hostile attitude of progressive workers to Christianity, but there is indeed no such hostility. Socialist and other agitators hurl thunderbolts of superbly passionate invective against Churchianity, against what they feel to be organized masquerade, but there is ever reverence and love for Jesus . . . the Christ of the Gospels, they revere as a great comrade." (John Spargo, *The Spiritual Significance of Modern Socialism,* 33-4)

In 1907 J. Keir Hardie, founder of the Independent Labor Party in England, published *From Serfdom to Socialism.* In chapter IV he stated: "My purpose in writing this chapter will have been served if I have succeeded in showing that the Socialist who denounces rent and interest as robbery, and who seeks the abolition of the system

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

which legalizes such, is in the true line of apostolic succession with the pre-Christian era prophets, with the Divine Founder of Christianity, and with those who for the first seven hundred years of the Christian faith maintained even to the death the unsullied right of their religious faith to be regarded as the Gospel of the poor." Be it noted that the "first seven hundred years of the Christian faith" with which Hardie linked the Socialists included a century and a half of official Christian service to the Roman slaveholders, from the reign of Constantine I in the early Fourth Century to the end of the Western Roman Empire in 476, and over three centuries of service to the Byzantine emperors and Feudal Kings.

Hardie's attachment to Christ was even greater than to Marx. In an election address in 1900 he said: "My cause is Labour's cause—the cause of Humanity—the cause of God. I first learned my Socialism in the New Testament, where I still find my chief inspiration." (Cited in *Socialism and Religion* by Socialist Educational Society, 44; also in Spargo's *Marxian Soc. and Rel.,* 133). The author of *Merrie England* in another work instructed the workers: "Study the words of Christ and the Apostles, and you will find that the true dignity and honor of the great and the strong are in their sacrifice, not in their clothing and wages." (Robert Blatchford, *Socialism,* 15). J. Ramsay MacDonald wrote that a Socialist "finds in the ethics of the Gospels a marvellous support for his economic and political proposals." *(Socialism,* 99). Sometimes the Socialists in their Christianism swing almost to the position of the Salvation Army preachers: "It is worthy of remark that when, in the summer of 1910, some three hundred English Socialists, representing the Labor Party, visited France and Belgium, they bore banners inscribed: 'We represent 500,000 English work-people. One for all and all for one. We proclaim the Fatherhood of God and human brotherhood. Jesus Christ, the social reformer, leads and inspires us." (Spargo, 134). Ernest Untermann, editor of the American edition of *Capital,* injected anti-Semitism in his work *Science and Revolution:* "Jesus had transformed the Jewish god of hate into a god of love and a prince of peace." (33). Untermann inserted an indirect Crucifixion incitement against the Jews: "But the modern proletarian remembers the cross on Golgotha." *(Ibid.)*

The popularization of the Christ legend and even of the Church-adopted image of Christ by the American Marxists reached a fairly high water mark during the war of 1914-18. A book heartily recommended by the top circles of the Socialist Party was *War-What-For* by a Socialist writer George Kirkpatrick. In it the author cries out: "Speak! Speak!—you leaders of the toil-stained multitude whom the Great Christ of Peace so boldly defended." (244). "Christ is great, fascinatingly, commandingly great." (262). The Socialists included in their Left-Christian ideology the Church's pseudo-pacifist symbol of Jesus as the "Prince of Peace." Kirkpatrick used a picture of Jesus

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

gazing at rows of cannon-shells and remarking sadly "In my name! After nineteen hundred years!" (245)

The Marxist writers, with surprising candor, revealed the active, loyal adherence of members of their organizations to the Church: "In Great Britain the chief leaders in the Independent Labor Party are ardent members of the conformist and non-conformist churches, while the Church Socialist League, with its large following among the clergy, is extremely active in the movement." (Laidler, *Socialism in Thought and Action,* 156-7). "In the Socialist Party of America there are thousands of men and women who loyally maintain religious affiliations. At a national convention of the Party it is not at all uncommon to find, among the delegates, loyal Roman Catholics, clergymen belonging to various Protestant sects, active Christian Scientists, Spiritualists, Baptists Presbyterians, Methodists, Lutherans—and so on through the list of Protestant sects." (Spargo, *Marxian Soc. and Rel.* 138)

When Morris Hillquit was subjected to the "comradely" anti-Semitic campaign he rocked the Socialist Convention with indignation. But he himself was meanwhile sustaining Church influence in the Socialist movement. The Catholic Church, he had declared as far back as 1914, might bless the Socialist system: "And still I should advise my good Catholic comrades in the Socialist and labour movement not to take the attacks of their Church too much too heart. For just as the Church has ever opposed every progressive and revolutionary movement, just so has it uniformly reconciled itself with those movements in the hours of their triumph and victory . . . It is therefore quite within the realm of the possible that when the Socialist movement shall have attained its object, and the Socialist commonwealth shall be an accomplished fact, the Catholic Church will confer on it its belated blessings, and proclaim it the only God-ordained social order." *(Socialism Promise or Menace,* 209)

Max Eastman in his address to the jury in the second *Masses* trial, on October 4, 1918, stated: "I was brought up with the utmost love for the character and the beauty of the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and I count Him much nearer in His faith and His influence to the message of the Socialists than to the message of any other political body of men."

In the American Socialist movement the greatest font of Marxist Left Christianism was Eugene V. Debs. The most glamorous Socialist figure in his day, Debs spread an ideology derived from the Church Fathers: "The martyred Christ of the working class, the inspired evangel of the downtrodden masses, the world's supreme revolutionary leader, whose love for the poor and the children of the poor hallowed all the days of his consecrated life, lighted up and made forever holy the dark tragedy of his death, and gave to the ages his divine inspiration and his deathless name." *(The Cry For Justice,* Upton Sinclair, ed. 345). A biographer of Debs records: "Debs' conception of Christianity is revealed in his description of an interview with a minister who visited

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

his cell in Atlanta prison. 'I told my friend of the cloth,' he recalled, 'that I did not believe Christ was meek and lowly, but a real, living, vital agitator who went into the Temple with a lash and a knout and whipped the oppressors of the poor, routed them out of doors and spilled their blood-got silver on the floor . . . He denounced the profiteers, and it was for this that they nailed his quivering body to the cross and spiked it to the gates of Jerusalem, not because he told men to love one another. That was a harmless doctrine. But when he touched their profits and denounced them before their own people he was marked for crucifixion.' The minister was glad to escape and never returned, but the Catholic chaplain of the prison remained one of Debs' closest friends. Throughout his imprisonment Debs kept a large portrait of Jesus of Nazareth on the wall of his room." (Ray Ginger, *The Bending Cross, A Biography of Eugene V. Debs,* 399)

It is quite understandable why the Catholic priest became a close friend of the eminent Marxist leader. Debs performed a valuable service to the Church. The minister could not have objected to Debs' story about Jesus and the Temple because Debs had taken it almost verbatim from the *New Testament (Mat.* 21:12, 13). However, the Catholic clergyman, officially attached to the prison staff, undoubtedly realized that Debs in an emotional way was a supporter of the Church mythology.

2. *Left Christianism of the German, French and other Social Democratic Parties*

An American Socialist writer, while admitting the existence of Left Christianism in the Marxist movement, attempted to give the impression that it has been confined to the Anglo-Saxon countries—". . . in the English-speaking countries, at all events, not only the bourgeoisie but frequently also the proletarian movements attempt to justify themselves from Scripture. The teachings of the Bible and the Sermon on the Mount are frequently called to the aid of the revolutionary party; Christian Socialists, in the English and American, not the continental sense of the term, as such are admitted to the International Congresses; and other evidences of the compatibility of religion with the proletarian movement can be traced." (Austin Lewis, Introduction to Engels' *Feuerbach)*

However, Left Christianism has been present also in non-English speaking parties of the Marxist movement. "In every country Socialism numbers among its adherents many men and women of religious faith and affiliations. In the German Reichstag among the Social Democratic representatives loyal Roman Catholics have sat for years. The first Roman Catholic to enter the Norwegian Storthing was elected as a Socialist, while another Socialist representative elected at the same time was a Lutheran clergyman." (John Spargo, *Marxian Socialism and Religion,* 137-8). Many of the 110 German Social Democratic rep-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

resentatives in the Reichstag were members of various Christian congregations: "In Germany, of the 110 members of the Reichstag in 1912, 22 belonged to the established Protestant churches, 17 to the other Protestant churches, 4 to the Catholic church . . ." (Walling, Stokes, Hughan and Laidler, *The Socialism of Today,* 30. Cited by Laidler, *Socialism in Thought and Action,* 157). "Karl Kautsky, while stating as his personal view that the belief in a personal God and a personal immortality is irreconcilable with modern science, admits, nevertheless, that it is possible to be a good Christian and a Socialist at the same time: 'One may well be a good Christian and still feel the warmest sympathy for the class struggle of the proletariat,' he says, and again, 'the striving of the masses for the abolition of class distinction is perfectly reconcilable with the Christian teaching of the Gospels.' " (Spargo, 154). Spargo gives as the source of Kautsky's statement: *Die Sozialdemokratie und die Katholische Kirche.*

Karl Liebknecht accused the imperialists of disgracing Christianity: ". . . that colonial policy which, pretending to spread Christianity of civilization or to protect national honor, piously practices usury and fraud for the advantage of capitalists interested in colonies; which murders and violates defenseless human beings, burns down the possessions of the defenseless, robbing and pillaging them, mocking and disgracing Christianity and civilization." *(Militarism,* 32)

Fredrich Adler was a leading Austrian Social Democrat who, in September 1916, in protest against the war, shot the Austrian Prime Minister Sturgkh. At his trial, Adler stated: "It is our moral duty to work according to the words of Marx, to organize a new society that knows no other aim but labor within and peace without . . . Two views of life are struggling for supremacy in the world. The one is expressed in the great teaching of Christianity: 'Thou shalt not kill.' This teaching is upheld today by the true representatives of Christianity, not by those who degrade it, but by those who are accused and slandered by these 'Christians.' " *(I Accuse,* 35-6)

Another leading Austrian Marxist, editor of *Arbeiter Zeitung,* wrote: "These Anabaptists were Christians with a profound faith. They led a truly Christian existence, tolerated no vice, were willing to help their brothers and sisters and for their enemies had only words of peace and indulgence. It is to God and not for us to exercise vengeance, such was one of the principles of their community. These Anabaptists were Socialists, who tried to revive the communism of the primitive Christian communities . . . The Social Democracy, struggling to prevent the abuse of the religious sentiments of the people in order to maintain the domination of capital should recall the memory of these profoundly believing Christians and Socialists, who, just 400 years ago, suffered by the thousands the torture in the dungeons of the Hapsburgs or died on the pyres of the Catholic counter-reformation." (Otto Bauer, *Le Socialisme, La Religion et L'Eglise,* Preface iv-vi, 1928)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Left Christian ideology was present in Belgian Social Democracy. In 1898 the Library of Socialist Propaganda in Brussels reprinted parts of "Osterwald's Bible." In the Forword the Socialist editors said: "We publish in our library these textual fragments following Osterwald's version (1894 revision) on the Evangeline according to Saint Matthew. For Socialism can say like Christ . . ."

Jaures added his contribution to Left Christianism by likening the modern proletariat to Jesus: "It is by a Hegelian transposition of Christianity that Marx pictures the modern movement of emancipation. Just as the Christian God humbled himself to the lowest depth of suffering humanity in order to redeem humanity as a whole; just as the Saviour, to save mankind, had to lower himself to a degree of destitution bordering on animality, a situation beneath which no man could fall; just as this infinite abasement of God was the condition of the infinite elevation of man, so, in the dialectic of Marx, the proletariat, the modern Saviour, had to be stripped of all guarantees, deprived of every right, degraded to the depth of social and historical annihilation, in order that by raising itself it might raise all humanity. And just as the Man-God, to continue his mission, had to remain poor, suffering and humiliated until the triumphal day of the resurrection, that single victory over death which has freed all humanity from death, so the proletariat is only able to continue its mission in this logical scheme by bearing, until the final day of revolt, the revolutionary resurrection of humanity—a cross whose weight is ever increasing, the essential capitalistic law of oppression and depression." *(Studies in Socialism,* edited by J. Ramsay MacDonald, Ind. Labour Party, 1906, 71-2)

In 1896, Jules Guesde, during the debate in the Chamber of Deputies on the issue of nationalizing the drug-stores of France, stated: "Hence we collectivists repeat the words of Christ, 'Let us love one another,' and, alone amongst you, we try to make a living truth of them. We are trying to realize in the society of tomorrow all there is of humanity in the teachings of the Gospels; and that, as my colleague in the representation of the Nord, Citizen or Abbe Lemire, can testify, is not realized in the society of today. Yet my colleagues will probably vote presently against the municipal drug-stores. Would the Christ of whom he preaches have justified the modern custom of selling at cent per cent profit the medicine required to relieve the sufferings of our fellow-creatures? (applause from the Extreme Left)."

Another founder of the French Marxist movement, Lafargue, too, penned some Left Christian phrases: "Like Christ, the doleful personification of ancient slavery, the men, the women and the children of the proletariat have been climbing painfully for a century up the hard Calvary of pain." *(The Right to be Lazy,* 56); "the first Christians, could demand the abolition of slavery. They were revolutionaries." *(Social and Philosophical Studies,* 161)

A leading Belgian Socialist and one of the most eminent figures in

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the Second International very vividly upheld the Crucifixion legend: "But how is it possible that we can still find Socialists so thoughtless or so irresponsible as to defame the crucified one, the victim of the Pharisees and the Priests and to insult the Virgin, the sublime picture of maternal grief." (E. Vandervelde, "Le Mouvement Socialiste" No. 107, Nov. 1, 1902, VIII, 1930, *Enquete Sur L'Anticlericalisme et Le Socialisme)*

The Jewish leader of French Social-Democracy, Leon Blum, envisaged an affinity between the Socialists and the chief fountainhead of Christian anti-Semitism and suggested that Socialists teach Christianity to the masses: "Even the Catholic Church, although it has never withdrawn its condemnation of the principles of Socialism, has, in the course of the last fifty years, adopted points of view, particularly on the problems of labor and property, that take it along a road parallel with ours and perhaps even converging with ours, in a way that at least rules out all real incompatibility. In such a situation polemics are almost pointless and conflict baseless. The task of the Socialist movement is now only one of preaching and conversion. Like the Church in those periods of history when its temporal interests dangerously obscured the real purpose for which it existed, it must now rediscover the purity of its initial inspiration. Does that mean that religious propaganda is one of the tasks of Socialism? In a sense it does." *(For All Mankind,* 1946, 180). "The Church is exclusively a spiritual power. That is precisely why her presence in the international community seems to me pre-eminently desirable . . ." (162)

Left Christian Marxism envisaged religion in "Socialist" society: "From all this, it seems necessary to conclude that belief in another life is not at all incompatible with Socialist convictions. No more than the practice of a religion whatever it be, if it subsists, will not be incompatible with the proper functioning of a Socialist society . . . If someone, Bebel admits, still has religious needs, he will satisfy them with his co-believers." *(Encyclopedie Socialiste,* VI, 242, 239-240)

CHAPTER XIX.

THE BOLSHEVIK STATE EMPLOYING LEFT CHRISTIANISM AND CHRISTIAN ANTI-SEMITISM

1. *The Promotion of Left Christianism by the Lenin Regime*

GRADUATING from the Marxist school of double-talk, the Stalin historians expose some of the Left Christian content of Social Democracy as one of their means to win advanced elements of society: "Attempts to cover up the reactionary character of primitive Christianity are glaringly obvious in Kautsky and in his distortion of the question of the attitude of Christianity toward slavery. Kautsky

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

declares: 'What the first Christians' attitude toward slavery actually was we don't know' . . . although all the books of the New Testament, which, indcidentally, represents for Kautsky one of the most important 'root sources,' repeat all along 'servants obey your masters.'" *(Gr. Sov. Enc.,* LX, 140). "But he presented Christianity of the early epochs of its history as a revolutionary movement of the Jewish and Roman poor and the enslaved classes, which is absolutely false: Christianity from its very inception was a compromisist and not a revolutionary movement. The question of the existence of Christ, Kautsky hypocritically glosses over." *(Les. Sov. Enc.* IX, 604)

To appear objective and truly scientific, the Bolshevik historians give a fairly penetrating survey of the reactionary politics of the first Christian communities: "The most Ancient Christian communities, not yet recognized by the Roman Empire, were tending toward the State and supported it in every possible way. According to Tertullian, at the Christian worshipping gatherings prayers were said for the emperors, their officials and for all those in power. The Church from the outset guarded also the foundation of the then Roman society—slavery. The Apostolic messages instructed the slaves to obey their masters as if they would obey Christ (Ephes) . . . the early Church was an organization of the domination of the ruling classes of the then Roman society because already in the Second Century the highest Church hierarchy (episcopate) was being recruited primarily of Christians belonging to the wealthy elements of the urban population of the Roman Empire, and in the Third Century to the ruling and highest military circles of the Empire." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LX, 633-4). However, as in many other fields, the burocracy during the Rightist moments distorted the facts about the reactionary nature of Christianity. Thus: "The historians of the Soviet Union with extreme objectivity have established that Christianity for hundreds of years played a progressive role. A play which denied this progressive role of Christianity against heathen barbarism was removed from the program in Moscow." *(Com. Int.* Aug. 1938, 720)

On the surface the Bolshevik historians appear to be sincere in their criticism of Kautsky and in their explanation that Christianity, from its inception, was permeated with the spirit of servility and that "democracy" among the early Christians was the practice of maintaining the division of society into masters and slaves. That the primitive Christians were supporters of the Roman rulers is evident, of course, from the principles set forth in the *New Testament:* "Subject yourself to every ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him." *(First Epistle General of Peter,* Ch. II, 13-15). "And Jesus answering said unto them, 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.'" *(Mark,* XII, 17). Early Christianity was a religious movement of the lowest strata of various small property, trading and artisan elements, minor slavehold-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ers, all mercilessly oppressed by the powerful ruling nobility of Rome. It was a movement of non-resistance, humbly submitting to the will of the upper caste and carrying the message to the slaves that salvation lay in conversion, prayer and hope for a happy existence after death. Early Christainity entered the life of the slaves not as a liberating entity but as a supporter of their bondage, instructing them to divide their time between working for the masters and listening to the sermons of the Christian priests. The *Apostolic Constitutions,* supposedly drawn up by the Apostles and introduced in the First Century to the Church by Clement I, allegedly a direct disciple of St. Peter's, declared: "Let the slaves work five days; but on the Sabbath day and the Lord's day let them have leisure to go to church for instructions in piety." (VIII, 33). Justin Martyr (about 100-165 C.E.) indicated that the early Christians possessed slaves. (Usov, 26)

The insincerity and inconsistency of the Bolshevik historians becomes obvious when one investigates Engels, Marx and the practices of the Bolsheviks in relation to Left Christianism. Lenin in *State and Revolution* wrote: ". . . the Christians, after Christianity had attained the position of a State religion, 'forgot' the 'naivete' of primitive Christianity with its democratic-revolutionary spirit." There is not a single Stalin historian who has not read *State and Revolution* but they never criticised Lenin for repeating "Kautskian" drivel.

The true attitude of Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders toward Left Christian ideology expressed itself in their concrete practices after they assumed power. In 1917, before October, virtually the entire Russian working class and an immense section of the peasantry turned their back upon the bourgeois organized expression of Christianity. The best proof of this was the fact that the influence of the Church had collapsed, as testified to by Trotsky: ". . . the Church had not dared to interfere in events. This was plainest of all at the front, where the influence of the clergy had evaporated along with the discipline of fear. Denikin acknowledges this: 'Whereas the officers' corps did for a long time fight for its military authority and power to command, the voice of the pastors was silent from the first days of the revolution and their every participation in the life of the soldiers came to an end.' " *(H. of R. R.* II, 132)

Led to believe that the Bolshevik movement represented complete rejection of all religion, the Red Guards and the peasant-soldiers of the Revolutionary Army turned their mind away from Christian mythology; Lenin and Trotsky, upon establishing their burocratic power, turned that mind back. A clear enough start was made early in the Brest days. One of the members of the Bolshevik Delegation, the ex-Tsarist General Skolon, in a fit of despondency committed suicide. The Bolsheviks, among whom were some Jewish Marxists, officially attended his funeral conducted with Christian rites. The fact is recorded in the Bolshevik press: "The coffin of General Skolon carried into the church by the members of the Russian delegation and Ger-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

man officers . . . In the church were present all the members of both delegations." *(Petrogradsky Golos* #22, 1918). The Lenin Brest policy, in this instance, was to express respect for the Christian feelings of the Kaiser's diplomats and military officers.

In 1918 the Sverdlov-controlled machinery of the Lenin administration published a compilation of "proletarian" poetry, some of which reads as follows: "In the glorious heaven God's Mother promenades slowly and decorously and, with her white hand shielding herself, she gazes upon the Glorious Son. Lord, beloved Son, kind, gentle Jesus! Bring your light, you the perished one, to the dark, suffering Russia . . . Recall, beloved Son, the great passion on the Cross." *(Proletarsky Sbornik,* I, 33. "Publication of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets. Moscow, 1918.")

In the Winter of 1918 one of the "revolutionary" writers, Rurik Ivnev, composed a verse: "And You who stormed at one time, Crucified for the hatred of people, are looking upon the white hands of Pilate with the nights' silence." *(Poezia Revolutsionnoi Moskvi,* 60, edited by E. Ehrenberg). "Christ has risen from the dead." (63)

In 1918 the Petrograd Soviet issued a work *The Red Gospel* (R.) by V. Kniazev. It said on the cover: "Come and drink. This is the blood from the heart of a Red poet, a new lifegiving, the source of the New Testament." In one of the poems Kniazev addressed the masses: "Cleanse your soul and arise from the dead in the name of the Red Christ." (36)

In January 1918, when the Sovnarkom began to build its own Army, one of the Russian bourgeois poets, Alexander Blok, wrote a poem *The Twelve* in which he portrayed twelve marching Red Guards, evidently symbolizing the Bolshevik forces as the Twelve Apostles of the New Testament. The concluding words of the poem read: "Thus they tread with a mighty step—Behind them, a starving hound, Ahead, with a bloody flag, unseen in the snowdrift, free from the danger of bullets, in a snowy-pearly diffusion, in a white wreath of roses—Ahead is Jesus Christ."

No one had to teach the Bolshevik Marxists the political function of the image of Jesus in so far as the class struggle was concerned. The Stalin historians, though less erudite than Lenin and Trotsky, understand that: "Throughout the entire period of the existence of Christianity the image of the mythical Jesus Christ has played and is playing the greatest exploiting role, diverting the toiling masses from the revolutionary class struggle." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.,* XXVII, 733). But the Lenin-Trotsky regime printed two million copies of *The Twelve* and swamped the workers and the Red Army with it. Much space in the Bolshevik publications was devoted to the expressions of praise of this Left Christian work. The Commissar of Education intimated that the work was a piece of art influenced by the Revolution: ". . . the Revolution, as a grandiose social event, as an immense and multicolored drama, could in itself have yielded tremendous material for

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

art and to a considerable degree shape a new artistic soul. However, in the first years of the Revolution its influence on art was of little note. True, there was written *The Twelve* by Blok . . ." (Lunacharsky, *Krasnaya Gazeta,* Nov. 5, 1922). Another illustration of praise of this Left Christian poem reads: "In this reverent, almost religious work about the ultimate goals of the Revolution resides the key to the solution of the mysterious meaning of his stirring poem *The Twelve.* Only such poets that are capable to distinguish the first glimmer of the future beauty in repelling pictures of contemporary life have employed Christ as a symbol of the truth which is guiding us." (P. Kogan, "Alexander Blok i Revolutsia" *Pechat i Revolutsia,* 1921, II, 4)

Blok's literary activity is subdivided by the Stalin historians into several periods, and it is the fourth period during whch he produced *The Twelve* that endeared him to the Bolsheviks. "Fourth Period (1917-18) is characterized by Blok's revolutionary romanticism. Everything written by Blok is stamped with the tremendous influence of October . . . the poem *Twelve,* the most significant product of this period, is permeated with the 'music of the revolution.' The poet caught the grim grandeur and the tragic beauty of October. The entire sympathy of Blok is on the side of the twelve Red Guards at whose head marches Christ with a bloody flag—representing for Blok the personification of the highest truth on earth." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* VI, p. 512). The poem was translated into many languages. The Lovestone-Foster-Cannon leaders of the American section of the Comintern conducted special public lectures by Olgin, a top Jewish Marxist, on the "revolutionary" essence of *The Twelve.*

In 1919 the Petrograd Soviet under Zinoviev published a book of poems entitled *Medny Kit* by N. Kluev. In one poem, "The Song of the Sun-carrier," Kluev spoke of "Peoples-Christs partaking the sun." (9). In a poem "Lenin" the author said that "Lenin possessed the spirit of the Kerzhen" monastery, that "There is the abbot's shout in the decrees" and that "Lenin included tornado and storm among the angelic images." (14). In another poem headed only by three asterisks he brought in the Crucifixion:

> "God, again they are ringing,
> Driving the Golgotha nails . . .
> The pigeon over the gate has become a raven
> In order to peck out of you, the Crucified,
> The dream of the eyelashes and the heart—disgrace . . .
> Evidently the death flask has been drunk
> For You, the storm-presaging Christ." (16-17)

Here is how the Bolshevik Petrograd Soviet through the "revolutionary" poet Kluev "attacked" the old order, bringing in once again the Crucifixion theme:

> "You have tormented the people's soul,
> Defiled the bright garden of God . . .

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Christ will recoup from the thorny needles,
And the people will breathe easily . . ." (45)

In 1919 the State Publishing House issued selections from Yesenin. Here is a sample of Crucifixion theme from that selection: "And the wind is kissing in the service-berry the red sores of the invisible Christ." (9)

One of the Leftmost currents of 'Soviet" writing in the Lenin period of the Bolshevik State was represented by the journal *Kuznitsa,* a carrier of Left-Christian anti-Semitism, subtly poisoning the most advanced section of proletarian youth. Thus, one of the poets of this current said to the workers:

"Your Golgotha has exceeded the tortures of centuries . . . In the fire I have found immortality, more infinite then the immortality of Christ." Commenting upon this "Golgotha" poetry, a Bolshevik writer exclaimed: "This is not a bare slogan. This cannot be counterfeited; it opens up the suffering heart of the revolutionary proletarian, it is the worker spreading his palms so that the rusty nails might be driven into them, it is the Iron Messiah . . . suffering, but crucified on the fiery Cross of the Great Struggle." *(Kuznitsa,* "Organ of Proletarian Writers," #2, 1920, 24-5)

A Russian poet whom the Bolshevik regime at one time lifted to the highest level of popularity was Demian Bedny. Here is a sample of his Left Christian "Golgotha" writing:

"Any bloodsucker can easily secure a handy priest, a liar and a scoundrel . . . He will establish that in the old 'divine' books there is a direct prophesy about the commissars—Or he will put into Christ's mouth such words which will obscure the reason why Christ was crucified. He would not have been crucified if he had been friendly with the rich. And involuntarily, friends, a question arises: Supposing today Christ appeared, the real Christ, not the distorted one, and taught what he had taught before?. He would have again gotten Golgotha from the priests, not in a three-year period but in three weeks! . . ." ("Mischievous Demons," *Col. Wks.* Moscow, 1924, R. 135-6)

The following is a piece of Demian Bedny's Marxist Left Christian anti-Semitism in which he even quotes Matthew (27) about the Jewish priests turning over Jesus to Pilate: "Who crucified Christ? The Jews. The poor or the rich? 'The chief priests and elders' that's who the hangmen were! That's who gave Judas the bribe, intsructing him: Betray and accuse! That's who led Christ to Pilate, crying, Crucify! Crucify!" (273)

This Christian anti-Semitic poison of Demian Bedny, basically not one whit different from the poison in Dickens' *Life of Our Lord,* was spread among the Bolshevik masses and in the Red Army: "The popularity of Demian Bedny was extremely great. His works spread in millions of copies and found a wide and active echo in the masses. According to the data of Red Army libraries, Demian Bedny was the best read author." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* V, 173)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Bedny wrote at the dictates of the Lenin-Trotsky Bolshevik Central Committee, as attested to by Trotsky himself: "He is not a poet who has approached the Revolution, who has come down to it, who has accepted it. He is a Bolshevik whose weapon is poetry. And in this lies Demyan Biedny's exclusive power . . . Not only in those rare cases when Apollo calls him to the holy sacrifice does Demyan Bedny create, but day in and day out, as the events and the Central Committee demand." *(Literature and Revolution,* 213)

At the height of the Brest-made famine in 1921-1922 the Bolshevik authorities, to save their power, attempted to ease the situation through the use of some Church property. They accompanied their move with Left Christian propaganda, as recorded in a Comintern publication:

"This propaganda took the usual form of the colored picture poster. These posters were marvels of direct appeal, and demonstrated how naive religious or patriotic beliefs, so often attacked in the abstract by the Communists, can be used for, as well as against, the proletarian revolution, once the proletariat is in power. These posters . . . took the form of appeals to the peasants' primitive conceptions of Christianity. For instance, we had the picture of the early apostle worshipping in the woods under the stars of night, with tallow candle (not a golden one) to light the reading of the sacred word . . . Then there is the Volga victim, emaciated and bleeding, in the form of Christ with a crown of thorns." ("Bolshevism and Church Property" by D. Ivon Jones, *The Communist Review,* Aug. 1922, 199)

Kept in the dark regarding the true source of their tortures and agonies—Lenin's Brest policy, the burocratic usurpation of power at the Second Congress of Soviets, and, beyond that, the two political swindlers who had created the snare called "Marxism"—the emaciated Russian masses, bleeding from a thousand wounds, were induced by their Marxist tormentors to liken themselves to the mythical figure on the cross. And who caused the terrible agony to the "spasitel"—the Savior? For centuries the peasants had been taught by the Church, and lately told by the Bednys at the dictates of the Central Committee, that it was the rich Jews.In the context of the NEP, just introduced by Lenin, the hatred of millions of the Russian workers and peasants turned against the Nepmen who lived by speculation and commercial robbery. And who were the Nepmen? The burocats whispered: *the rich Jews!*

In connection with the confiscation of the Church treasures by the Lenin regime, Maxim Gorky made a very significant statement. Gorky, it must be noted, by then had restored amity with Lenin. "Indeed, beginning with the second half of 1918 Gorky already works ardently with the Soviet power . . . In 1921, at Lenin's insistence, Gorky goes abroad for a cure." *(G. S. Enc.* XVIII, 227). While abroad Gorky in a letter to the American Jewish Bolshevik paper, *Freiheit,* recorded his charge that Jewish Bolsheviks were deliberately used to

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

seize the treasures so that the wrath of the religious peasant masses should center upon the Jews:

"The Russian people is aroused against the Jews chiefly because they are participating in the anti-religious and anti-Church demonstrations as for example in the requisition of the Church treasures and sacred things. I told Sholom Ash that I know of several cases where young Jewish Communists were deliberately sent to carry out such tasks in order that the population, and particularly the peasantry, saw that the religious institutions and the sacred objects of Russia are being destroyed by Jews. This is done by those anti-Semites of whom there are not a few among the Communists themselves." *(Life and Nationalities,* R. Weekly Organ of the People's Commissariat of Nationalities, June 26, 1922)

Was Gorky's charge a monstrous slander or a monstrous truth? The fact stands that Stalin's Commissariat's journal *Life and Nationalities* printed the charge without branding it as a lie. And Gorky, neither abroad nor after his return to Russia, ever retracted his charge that Bolshevik anti-Semites during the Lenin period deliberately employed the Jewish Scapegoat in the process of seizure of Church treasures. If what Gorky charged was true than it is obvious that when later the Stalin regime used the Jewish Scapegoat during the severe housing and unemployment crises, it was not the first time that the Bolshevik State was using the Jews in their historical role. The precedents had been deliberately established in the Lenin period.

2. *Marxism and Myths of the Old Testament*

The linking of Biblical mythology with modern reality has been common in the Marxist movement. Krupskaya tells of an experience she and Lenin had in London in 1902-3:

"We once wandered into a social-democratic church. The Socialist in charge first read aloud, his nose glued to a Bible, and then preached a gospel something like this: The exodus of the Jews from Egypt symbolized the exodus of the workers from the Kingdom of Capitalism into the Kingdom of Socialism. Everyone stood and sang from a Socialist hymn-book: 'Lead us, O Lord, from the Kingdom of Capitalism into the Kingdom of Socialism.'" *(Memories of Lenin,* 73)

In March 1918 the Lenin-Trotsky regime distributed Demyan Bedny's *The Promised Land* (R.) among the revolutionary masses. In it Bedny likened Lenin to Moses, the Russian masses to the Biblical Israelites and Bolshevik "Socialism" to the so-called "promised land." We shall cite a few lines:

"In the beginning Moses lived illegally. At the first chance, being a believer in caution, he and his brother Aaron came to the Pharaoh. So and so, Your Majesty, the Jewish workers . . . are being exploited to the death. Pharaoh shouted: Out with you, loafers and scoundrels! . . .

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"So Moses, carrying out his ideas, began an agitation, distributed illegal leaflets, spent nights at meetings, and everywhere hammered one and the same point: Down with the predatory bourgeoisie! . . . And Moses gave instructions to all the poor people: clothes, all the gold, money, dishes—grab everything from the rich Egyptians! Have no mercy on the accursed bourgeoisie! . . . In the Menshevik papers . . . Moses was cursed: Irresponsible adventurer! Tramp! Scoundrel! Anarchist! . . .

"Moses turned to the people with a question: are you all prepared for the Exodus? The reply was, All prepared! Well, then, with God's help, move on, brothers!"

And Demian Bedny's "proletarian" mixture of the Old Testament and the October Revolution went on for many chapters.

The Comintern incorporated Moses and the Hebrew prophets into Marxist ideology. Thus: "We will yet redeem the proud race that brought forth Jeremiah, the people's prophet, Moses, the leader of slaves, Jesus, the rebel . . . We will go back two thousand years and find the smooth pebble and sling of David . . ." (M. Gold, *Daily Worker,* April 5, 1924). The same line has been followed by the Socialist Marxists. Judge Jacob Panken, who at the Milwaukee Convention had raised the cry that the Party anti-Semites wanted to crucify Hillquit, declared: "I have always stood up as a dignified man, as a dignified Jew, never ashamed of the fact that I sprang from the people of Moses and Aaron, and also of Jesus and Paul." *(Workmen's Circle Call,* May 1942)

The Marxist leaders of the Jewish Workmen's Circle sent a cable to the Zionist Parliament: "Sharing your joy on this occasion we convey our wholehearted wishes for your every success, confident that Medinath Israel will find the way to peace through brotherhood and fulfill the mission of our prophets for genuine social justice." *(Ib.* March, 1949)

Hebrew myths have been used by some Socialists in a direct anti-Semitic way. Thus, Beatrice Webb, an eminent Fabian Socialist writer, utilized "Moses" for her anti-Semitic vaporings:

"In the East End tailoring trade the characteristic *love of profit* in the Jewish race has a twofold tendency: to raise the workers as individuals, and to depress the industry through which they rise . . . Is it surprising, therefore, that in this nineteenth century, with its ideal of physical health, intellectual acquisition, and material prosperity, the chosen people, with three thousand years of training, should in some instances realize the promise made by Moses to their forefathers: 'Thou shalt drive out nations mightier than thyself, and thou shalt take their land as an inheritance'?" *(My Apprenticeship,* 1926, 427, 8)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

3. *The Stalin Regime Disseminates Christian Anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R.*

Whereas in the Lenin period of the Bolshevik State the shaping of the psychology of the Russian masses along Left Christian and Christian-anti-Semitic lines was confined primarily to the art field, under the pretext of poetic licence, and to the reprinting of the refined Fourierist-Marxist variety of anti-Semitism, under Stalin, amidst the exuberant flow of Russian-Marxist chauvinism and other anti-proletarian ideological toxicants, there has taken place a monstrous expansion of Left Christian anti-Semitism. Stalin introduced an extraordinarily effective method in achieving the dissemination of the morbid, highly-contagious virus: the repeated reprinting of the old popular Russian writers whose works in greater or lesser degree are contaminated with palpable anti-Semitism. Choice examples can be cited.

No writer was ever revered more by the Russian bourgeoisie than Leo Tolstoy. There was not a single substantial library in Russia that did not boast of a Tolstoy shelve. After the Bolsheviks took over, they decided to make Tolstoy more popular with the masses than had been done by the bourgeoisie. Bonch-Bruevich in an article "Lenin and Tolstoy" testified: "I heard more than once from Vladimir Ilyitch that we must thoroughly go over all Tolstoy's works, and, apart from a complete academic edition, issue numerous of his stories, articles, fragments, in separate pamphlets and booklets and spread them in hundreds of thousands of copies among the peasants as well as among workers. In 1918 yet, soon after the Soviet Government moved from Petrograd to Moscow, in reply to V. G. Chertkov, to whom L. N. Tolstoy entrusted the care of full posthumous publication of his works, Vladimir Ilyitch ordered that this question be submitted at the earliest date to the collegium of the People's Commissariat of Education where it was then decided in principle in a favorable way, and, as it is known, at the present time is being realized thanks to the special order of the Sovnarkom." *(Ogonek,* #46, 1927, 4)

Working with greater thoroughness than the Russian bourgeoisie had ever attempted, the Stalin-ruled Sovnarkom set up a special machinery for collecting everything Tolstoy had written. *(Les. Sov. Enc.* VIII, 848). The Editorial Committee for the publication of Tolstoy's works was headed by the two leading figures of the Commissariat of Education, Lunacharsky and Pokrovsky, assisted by Bonch-Bruevich and others. In a preface appearing in the first volume they stated: "In token of the aproaching on the 10th of September 1928 one hundredth anniversary of birth of Leo Nikolaevich Tolstoy a jubilee edition of his first complete collected works is being issued."

Everyone who has read Tolstoy knows that he glorified the mythical Christ and this glorification is sometimes manifestly tainted with anti-Semitism, as in his letter to A. A. Tolstoy written in March 1882

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

`= Mozilla/5.0
HTTP_ACCEPT-

in a pogrom atmosphere then prevailing in Russia: "Christ said to the Jews, you and I are not of the same father—your God father is the devil, in other words, a lie." (*Wks.* LXIII, R. 92. Moscow-Leningrad, 1934)

But there is one work of Tolstoy which is really monstrous in its essence. The title of the work is "The Teaching of Christ, rendered for Children." Tolstoy wrote it in June 1908; he had originated it in 1907 just at the end of the pogrom period which had been ushered in with Kishinev. In a preface he explains how the work came about: "Last year I formed a little school of peasant children from ten to thirteen years of age. Wishing to impart Christ's teaching to them in a way that would be plain to them and would have an influence on their life, I related to them in my own words those parts of the four Gospels which appeared to me most understandable and accessible to children, and at the same time most necessary for moral guidance in life . . . Guided by that I composed this booklet."

The "parts of the four Gospels which appeared to me most understandable" were chiefly those which accused the Jews of torturing and crucifying Jesus. Some of these parts Tolstoy taught to the peasant children read:

"And the Jews surrounded Him and said: 'Everything You said is difficult to grasp and is at variance with our scripture . . . are You that Messiah, who, according to our scripture, must come to the world?' And Jesus replied . . . And the Jews were offended by these words and seized stones in order to murder Him . . . And the scribes and pharisees did all in their power to ruin Jesus . . . They were saying: 'This man must be stopped. He is propounding His teaching in such a way that, if He be left alone, all will believe in Him and will discard our religion . . . And if all will accept His teaching that all people are children of one Father and all are brothers and that there is nothing specially different in our Jewish people from other peoples, then the Romans will invade and conquer us and there will no longer be a Jewish kingdom' . . . And then the entire people and the guards fell upon Jesus and began spitting in His face and slap his cheeks . . . And Pilate turned his back to Jesus and again went out to the Jews and said to them: 'I consider that this man has done no evil' . . . When Jesus was brought to Pilate in the second time, Pilate again called the Jewish leaders and said to them: 'You brought this Man before me on the charge that he is arousing the people, and I questioned Him in your presence and I don't see wherein He is a rebel. I sent Him together with you to Herod, and there too, as you see, nothing of evil was found in Him. And I consider that He has done nothing for which He should be executed; why not give Him a lashing and release Him?' But when they all heard this, they cried: 'No, execute Him in a Roman fashion: crucify Him on a cross!' Pilate heard them out and said: 'Good, but you know the ancient tradition that for the sake of the Passover holiday it is necessary to pardon one criminal. There

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

is a robber Barabbas who is condemned to death and now also this man. So one of them may be released. Whom shall I release, Jesus or Barabbas?' Pilate wanted to save Jesus, but the chief priests influenced the people in such a way that all cried: 'Barabbas, Barabbas!' Then Pilate asked: 'What is to be done with Jesus?' And again they all cried: 'In a Roman fashion, upon the cross, put Him upon the cross!' . . . Pilate was so anxious to free Jesus that he again spoke to the people saying: 'How is it that you want to crucify your king?' But the Jews replied: 'If you release Jesus you will establish thereby that you are false to Caesar because whoever declares himself king is an enemy of Caesar. We have only one Caesar, but this king you should crucify.' And when Pilate heard this he understood that now he could not evade executing Jesus. Then Pilate stepped toward the Jews, poured water upon his hands before them and said 'I wash my hands of the blood of this innocent Man.' And the people cried: 'Let His blood be upon us and on our children' . . . And when Jesus already hung on the cross the people surrounded Him and abused Him . . ." *(Wks.* Birukov ed. 1913. XV, 271, 277, 286, 287, 288, 289)

What was Tolstoy accomplishing with his school for peasant children and later with his booklet which was read by both children and adults? *He was manufacturing future pogromists!*

The subtle Left Christian anti-Semite, Tolstoy, knew the force of repetition. Desirous to implant the story of the Crucifixion deep into the mind of his readers he appended a series of questions to recall every separate point in that story. We cite a few of these questions:

"What did Jesus reply to the question: Was He the Messiah? What did the Jews say to this and what did they want to do?" "What did Pilate say to the Jews and what did they reply to him? How did Pilate question Jesus in front of the Jews?" "What did Pilate wish to do with Him, and what did the Jews wish?" "How did Pilate seek to save Jesus and what was demanded by the Jews?" "How did Pilate defend Jesus and what did the Jews say?" "How was Jesus led to the place of execution and crucified?"

In another work Tolstoy explained what pattern he followed in transmitting the Crucifixion pogrom incitement to his victims in general, young and old: "I taught and teach the sacred history only in line with the Bible and consider every other teaching as damaging . . . The New Testament is not retained in memory so well and I therefore demand to repeat it more often." *(Wks.* VIII, 90, Moscow, 1936)

And here is a sample of Bolshevik popularization of Tolstoy:

"Tolstoy and Lenin—two greatest Russian geniuses, and of centuries two greatest geniuses of mankind. Both embodied the great social problems of the epoch. But Tolstoy gave a criticism of the evil without showing the paths towards its removal and therefore his teaching objectively signified submission to the evil. Lenin pointed the road toward the good and organized the will toward achieving the triumph of the good." (Introductory to *Lenin i Tolstoy,* R. I, 39. Pub-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Mozilla/5.0
HTTP_ACCEPT-

lished by the Communist Academy, Moscow, 1928). The Communist Academy, as we have seen, was guided by Pokrovsky, advertised as the greatest Marxist-Bolshevik scholar and historian—prior to the 1934-1938 bloody phase of Stalin's centralization.

Let us go back a moment to 1910 and see the reaction of the Black Hundreds to the news that Tolstoy, after he had fled his home, contracted pneumonia and lay on his death bed. All the pogrom-mongering literati expressed the most profound concern lest the disease would be fatal. The blame for his flight was, of course, laid to the Jews. The foremost large pogromist newspaper in Russia wrote: "Neither the State nor the Church disturbed the quiet of the life of this genius . . . it was the Jewish spirit of commerce and revolutionary stock-jobbing, alien to the State and the Church. Precisely from their Egyptian bondage the soul of the last of our great men is freeing itself." *(Novoye Vremia,* Nov. 19, (6) 1910)

At the news of Tolstoy's death many of the reactionaries shed tears. The entire bourgeois press, including the extreme Right, appeared black-bordered in token of deep respect and grief. As to the Tsar Nicholas the Bloody—"Upon the most humble report by the Minister of Internal Affairs on the demise of Count L. N. Tolstoy, His Imperial Majesty willed to set down the following words: 'Sincerely regret the demise of the great writer who embodied in the flourishing period of his genius, in his creations, the native images of one of the most glorious years of Russian life. May the Lord God be his merciful Judge.' " *(Novoye Vremia,* Nov. 22, (9) 1910)

It is instructive to show how the Social Democratic Fraction of the State Duma, composed of seven Mensheviks and seven Bolsheviks, reacted to Tolstoy's death. By a unanimous Bolshevik-Menshevik decision, in a telegram to Tolstoy's friend, Chertkov, the Fraction, "expressing the feelings of the Russian and international proletariat, deeply mourns the loss of the genius artist, irreconcilable and unconquered warrior with the official Church, antagonist of arbitrariness and enslavement, who loudly raised his voice against death penalty—friend of the persecuted." *(Rech,* #307, Nov. 21 (8) 1910; *Lenin i Tolstoy,* I, 149)

"Besides the telegram, two deputies were delegated to attend the funeral of the writer, with the instruction to lay a wreath on the coffin with this inscription: 'To Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy, the Social Democratic Fraction of the State Duma from the Russian proletariat.' " *(Lenin i Tolstoy,* I, 149-150)

To the point on Tolstoy's role as a propagandist for the pogromists must be added the fact that this old Liberal writer provided himself with an effective anti-pogrom false face usually worn by concealed anti-Semites. Silent for decades on the issue of ever-increasing persecution and massacres of the Jews, Tolstoy, after the 1905 pogroms, wrote a letter in which he joined the general Liberal-Marxist chorus that charged the officials with the perpetration of the butcheries

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

of the Jews. Not long after, he established his school for peasant children to teach them that the Jews murdered Christ, painting the Crucifixion pogrom tale in colors that gave it an appearance of historical authenticity.

Out of the mass of Russian-chauvinist Christian and Left Christian anti-Semitic literature with which Stalin has been saturating the population of the Bolshevik State we shall cite one more example—the reprinting of Dostoyevsky's incitement against the Jews. In his "Diary of a Writer" Dostoyevsky said:

"Let us assume it is difficult to learn the forty-centuries old history of such a people as the Jews. But in the first place I already know one thing, that probably there is no other people in the whole world which would so lament its fate every minute, at each step and word, its humiliation, its suffering, its martyrdom. One might think it is not they who reign in Europe, not they who at least only direct the stock exchanges there and therefore politics, internal affairs, and morals of the states." (XII, R. 79. Moscow-Leningrad, 1929, State Publishing)

Referring to Alexander II as liberator of the peasantry from serfdom, Dostoyevsky drew a picture of enslavement of the Russian peasants and of other peoples of Russia by the Jew:

"Then came the liberator and freed the basic people, and what happened, who was the first to fall upon it as upon a victim, who was it that took advantage of its vices primarily, who entangled it with his age-long gold profession and immediately replaced wherever he could and was in time, the eliminated landlords, with this difference, that though the landlords heavily exploited the people, yet they strove not to ruin their peasants even in their own interests in order not to exhaust their labor strength. But the Jew is not concerned with the exhaustion of Russian strength, he took his and departed. I know that the Jews, reading this, will immediately yell that this is not true, that this is slander, that I am lying, that the reason I believe all this nonsense is because 'I don't know the forty-centuries' old history' of these pure angels, who are incomparably 'morally purer not only than other nationalities but also than the Russian people whom I deify' (according to the correspondent, see above). But let them, let them be morally purer than all the peoples in the world, and naturally purer than the Russians . . . And ten days ago I have read in *Novoye Vremia* #371 a dispatch from Kovno of the most characteristic nature: 'the Jews have fallen upon the local Lithuanian population to such a degree as to have nearly ruined all with vodka, and only the priests saved the poor people, who drunk themselves to death, threatening them with tortures of hell and organizing among them temperance societies' . . . educated local economists began to launch village banks in order to save the people from the Jew-usurer and village markets so that 'the poor toiling masses' secure products of subsistance at real prices and not at the price set by the Jew." (80-81)

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

illa/5.0
ACCEPT-

And finally here is Dostoyevsky's virtually open call for a "preventive" extermination of the Jews in Russia:

"But if there were in Russia three million Russians, not Jews, and eighty million Jews—well, what would they have done to the Russians, what would they have turned them into? Would they have allowed equal rights? Would they have permitted them freedom of worship? Would they not have transformed them at once into slaves? Would they not have done worse than that and altogether torn their skin off? Would they not beat them to a pulp, to final extermination, as they had done with stronger peoples in the distant past, in their Ancient history?" (82-3)

This blood-whipping propaganda of a Left-Christian anti-Semite Dostoyevsky was reprinted and disseminated by the Stalin burocracy without even a critical warning against his poison of anti-Semitism! In fact, one finds the very opposite from enlightenment in Bolshevik reference books regarding the "Diary of a Writer." Here is one instance: "The Diary of a Writer won a tremendous popularity and was bought zealously. Dostoyevsky becomes something of a prophet, apostle and teacher of life. From all parts of Russia he was swamped with letters, the correspondents expecting from him enlightenment and instruction." (*Literaturnaya Enc.* III, 401)

Whereas Marx and Engels used a direct and virtually explicit manner to inflame the pogrom sentiment of the Posen priests and "revolutionists" against the Polish Jews, the Bolshevik burocracy has been accomplishing this goal, on a much wider area than Posen, through such indirect media as the reprinting of the "Diary of a Writer." In it Dostoyevsky, pointing to the borderlands of Great Russia, incited the Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian and other populations against the Jews: "Ask in our borderlands the local population: what is guiding the Jew, and what has been guiding him in so many centuries? You will receive a unanimous answer: *ruthlessness;* all these centuries he has been guided by ruthlessness toward us in the thirst for our sweat and blood." (86). In discussing the situation of the Russian masses, Dostoyevsky said, "The Zhids will drink the people's blood . . ." (97)

The Stalin burocrats have been pretending ignorance about the anti-Semitic essence of Dostoyevsky's works. Yet, even the Jewish Liberal *Evreiskaia Encyclopedia,* which was published in Russia during the Tsarist regime, defying the Russian bourgeois "opinion," described him quite outspokenly: "Dostoyevsky—famous Russian writer, one of the most significant promoters of Russian anti-Semitism. At first through Jewish characters interspersing his creative art, and then through his journalistic articles, Dostoyevsky invariably stood as an enemy of the Jews, in the beginning despising them, and later hating them." (VII, 310)

It would be wrong, however, to assume that the policy of popularizing Dostoyevsky's anti-Semitic writings in the Bolshevik State was

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ozilla/5.0
_ACCEPT-

originated by Stalin. As a matter of record, this policy was introduced by the Lenin regime, and already in the first period of the Bolshevik State interest in Dostoyevsky's writings was well aroused among the advanced workers.

On November 11, 1921 an imposing Dostoyevsky Exhibition was opened in Petrograd by the Lenin Government commemorating the hundredth anniversary of his birth. In the organization of the Exhibition a number of very influential State institutions participated: "The Russian Academy of Sciences and the Petrograd Institute, The Russian Public Library, The Central Library of Russian Drama, The First Division of the IV Section of the Chief Archive . . . The Historic-Revolutionary Archives, The Museum of the Revolution, The University of Petrograd." (Pushkinsky Dom, *Vistavka v Pamiat Stoletia so Dnia Rojdenia F. M. Dostoevskogo,* 1). Among the exhibits was a chapter from the "Diary of a Writer." (3). The chief speaker at this fundamentally anti-Semitic affair was Lenin's Commissar of Education, Lunacharsky.

The esteem which the Lenin regime manifested for the "Diary" was an indirect inducement to the visiting workers to read it. Yielding to the subtle stimulant, an interested worker did not have to wait until the Bolshevik State reprinted the "Diary." In 1921 and years afterward one could obtain it in every sizable library in Russia; and, just as under the Tsar, readers, unprotected by the scientific antidote to the poison of anti-Semitism, would innocently absorb the potent virus.

Lunacharsky exalted Dostoyevsky almost to a point of divination. The Lenin policy obviously was to make the Russian masses, particularly the youth whose molding was almost completely in the hands of the Sovnarkom, feel that Dostoyevsky's Left-Christian anti-Semitic ideology was a brightly shining light falling upon their path. Lunacharsky carried out this policy with majestic eloquence: "Russia is advancing forward upon a tormenting but glorious road, and in the background, blessing her upon this road, stand the figures of her great prophets, and among them, perhaps the most fascinating and beautiful, is the figure of Dostoyevsky." *(Krasnaya Nov,* Nov-Dec. 1921, 211)

The writers in the service of the Bolshevik dictators wrote with touching sympathy about this anti-Semitic darling of the Russian bourgeoisie and of Russian Marxism. They portrayed him as a teacher of the proletariat. Thus: "In what respect is Dostoevsky dear to us? . . . he taught, he continues, and perhaps even in a greater measure he will continue to teach, commensurate with the expansion of his literary audience." *(F. M. Dostoevsky,* A. C. Dolinin, ed. 1, 1922, State Printing)

A Bolshevik, L. P. Grossman, a Jew himself, favorably presented the great anti-Semitic writer as a remarkable forecaster of historical development. Grossman directed the mind of the workers toward the "Diary" which he pictured in a positive vein: "During recent years

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

in Russia and in the West there has been clearly observable a rising interest in Dostoevsky . . . The complex problems, posed in all their sharpness in the disputes among Dostoevsky's heroes, have been put forth by the historical reality itself, corroborating and justifying many of the extraordinary forecasts of the author of the 'Demons' and of the 'Diary of a Writer.'" *(A Dostoevsky Seminar,* 3, State Publishing, Moscow-Petrograd 1923)

In Moscow the Lenin burocracy established "The Museum of Dostoevsky." Abroad supporters of the Bolshevik State went to the length of painting the Russian pogromist propaganda writer as a Communist of a sort. Thus: "Communist Dostoevsky . . ." (Kurt Eisner, *Soviet Russia,* March 1, 1922, 117)

The case of Dostoevsky is the clinching proof of utter consciousness of Lenin's anti-Semitic politics. Though in contrast with Marx's practice Lenin never in his writings made explicit anti-Semitic remarks, he conducted, through a subtle, seemingly indirect way, a policy of spreading anti-Semitism among the workers under the deceptive guise of officially "fighting" anti-Semitism. With regard to anti-Semitism, Stalin, as virtually on all other questions, merely followed in Lenin's footsteps.

CHAPTER XX.

DEVELOPMENT OF MARXIST NEO-CHRISTIANITY BY THE BOLSHEVIK STATE

1. *The Birth of the Bolshevik Left Christian Church under Lenin*

AFTER THE Civil War a widespread movement sprang up in the Russian Church advocating support of the Bolshevik regime. Many priests grasped that they were confronted with the choice of either clinging to dead Tsarism or of entering the service of living Marxism which, under the pretense of building Socialism, had established a privileged minority group dictatorship which depended upon numerous reactionary accessories for the maintenance of its power. The stratum of Orthodox priests who sensed that Lenin sought to attire Christianity in a Left garb and make it worth their while was given a "democratic" coat of "progressive" paint by the Bolshevik press. *Pravda* of May 14, 1922 wrote:

"Church Democracy Against Church Feudalism. Today we print an appeal of a group of progressive priests who sharply protest against the counter-revolutionary conduct of Patriarch Tikhon and demand his trial. This appeal must be read by every believer."

The appeal of "Church Democracy," printed conspicuously in the Bolshevik press, opened with the assertion that the Sovnarkom regime was established in Russia through divine Christian intervention:

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Brothers and Sisters in Christ! In the last few years, by the will of God without which nothing occurs in the world, there exists in Russia a workers-peasants government . . . We, the undersigned clergy of the Orthodox Church, who are representative of the expression of wide Church circles, condemn the actions of those hierarchs and those ministers who are guilty of organizing action against the State power . . ." *(Pravda,* May 14, 1922)

Later, one of the "democratic" clergy, "progressive" Bishop Evdokim, a sponsor of the new policy, wrote in the Bolshevik press: "Under the Soviet power we can elevate our Church life to such an envious height of which one could not dream under Tsarism . . . It is not the Soviet power that hinders us but the patriarchal circles." *(Krasnaya Gazeta,* Aug. 12, 1932)

The Bolsheviks "diagnosed" the new Church movement to be of *revolutionary significance:* "No matter what the newly-born Church might be, how naive its new faith and the old Gospel principles, how helpless its attempts might be to bring this faith closer to the contemporary revolutionary environment—still thus far it is progressive in its movement; through its new faith it brings the masses closer to complete atheism, to the burial of the old and the new Church, towards the liberation of the religious past of the population from the remnants of pagan superstitions, from the influence of religion in general. And in this lies the positive, revolutionary significance of the movement for the 'Living Church.' " *(Krasnaya Nov,* May-June 1922, 232-3)

The Bolshevik press transparently hinted that the new Church would receive the backing of the Lenin-Trotsky regime: "To smash the old Church, to eliminate the gangrene of the old Church—this without doubt is a progressive and respectable task of the Living Church. It can be achieved only through the support of the viable, healthy forces of the people and, above all, of the State apparatus, or, speaking more correctly, with its assistance." *(Kr. Gaz.* Aug. 25, 1922). The Lenin-Trotsky regime was covering up its policy of building a Left Christian Church with "October" phrases—"the question of the Church plays a tremendous role in our country, since the Church was the last rampart of counter-revolution. It has not yet had an October Revolution." *(Ib.* Sept. 24, 1922). That the initiative to perform an "Ocober Revolution" in the old Church sprang from Lenin and Trotsky was also indicated in the Bolshevik press through the mouth of one of the priests supporting the Sovnarkom: "The State power in the Spring of this year proposed to change the Church policy. We met this with full sympathy." (Krasnitsky, *Ib.* Aug. 12, 1922)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *Stalin and Trotsky Continuing Lenin's Policy of Building the "Red" Christian Church*

With Lenin withdrawing from the direct piloting of the Bolshevik State, the Stalin Trio, in collaboration with Trotsky, arrived at a workable understanding with the "practical" Russian priests and— "The Second All-Russian Ecclesiastic Sobor taking place in 1923 . . . addressed to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee a special appeal in which such lines occur as these: 'The great October overthrow is carrying out in life the principles of equality and labor present in the Christian teachings.'" *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LX 186). The Bolshevik Church adopted a Marxist Left Christian resolution which stated: "After hearing the report of Archpriest A. Vvedensky, the All-Russian Sobor of the Orthodox Church testifies before the Church and all humanity that the entire world is now divided into two classes: capitalist exploiters and the proletariat, with whose blood and toil the capitalist world builds its own well-being. In the whole world, the Soviet Government of Russia is alone waging war on this social evil. Christians cannot remain indifferent spectators in this conflict. The Sobor declares capitalism to be a mortal sin and to wage war against it is a holy war for the Christian." (From the Resolution of the Sobor of the Living Church, 1923. *Life in Soviet Russia,* #101, 1935, 47)

Marxism always adhered to the fundamentally bourgeois theses of the separation of Church and State and of treating religion as a private affair. The Gentile bourgeoisie, using these theses, created the delusion that its State was non-Christian and at certain moments even non-religious. The Church officially became private, with the State giving it ideological support through observation of Christian holidays and in other ways. The Bolsheviks copied the method of the bourgeoisie in this field. Demian Bedny's Left Christian anti-Semitism was his "private" product and the Lenin-Trotsky regime pushed its distribution through the State apparatus under the cover of the legal "separation of the Church from the State." As the years went by, the Marxist Christian basic policy kept unfolding. The bureocrats themselves popularized the Christmas tree in the Bolshevik organizations.

"Bell ringing and the collection of funds for churches were allowed in 1936; the public performance of blasphemous plays and films as well as anti-Christmas and anti-Easter carnivals were prohibited by Stalin in 1938; manuals of history, ridiculing Russian Christianity, were taken away from schools in the same years; mass observance of Christmas and Easter festivals was recognized and workers were not prosecuted for absenteeism during these days; manufacture and sale of objects connected with worship were allowed to the State enterprises; and in 1938, icon painters of the Mstera district were permitted to exercise their trade in the following year; and so on." (S. Bolshakoff, *The Christian Church and the Soviet State,* 55)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

After January 1939 State shops began to restore old icons and sell oil for the image-lamps. An explanation was offered for restoring the tendency to give Christian names to children.

The revival of the Christian mythology by the Bolshevik burocrats after its collapse during 1917 moved at a leisurely pace in many spheres of social life. As in the bourgeois countries, the art museums served as one of the means to gradually spread Christian anti-Semitic corruption of the masses. To the old Tsarist museums filled with Christian art were added numerous confiscated private collections. Workers and their children have been encouraged to view these rich treasures but no enlightening explanation has ever been given regarding the anti-Semitic essence of Christian art. The legends and inscriptions on paintings and sculpture dealing with the Christ theme have tended to darken the mind and to turn sentiment against the Jews. We cite a few examples from an illustrated catalogue of the Hermitage, the art gallery of the Winter Palace in Petrograd, issued in 1922 under the Lenin-Trotsky regime. Here we find listed the "Crucifixion on Golgotha" by Duccio di Buoninsegna, "Maesta" presumed to be by Pietro Lorenzetti, and other "Emblems of Passion." An especially arresting picture is #45 "The Wail Over the Body of Christ (Pieta)"

During the Nazi invasion the Bolshevik burocrats made extensive use of Christ mythology through their "private" agency, the Left Church. Here is a sample of the services the Church performed for them: "Christ has risen and the demon is to fall. Christ has risen and the angels are joyous. Let us rejoice with them, celebrating the victory of Christ over the purgatory and death for ever, and in the temporary life here on earth—the victory of the cross of Christ over the swastica." (Metropolitan Sergei, April 2, 1942, *The Russian Orthodox Church and the Great Fatherland War*, 25). "The birth of God Jesus Christ on earth brought with it happiness to the people—freed from the power of sin . . . This year the holiday of the birth of Christ coincides with the holiday of the 25th anniversary of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic. Let the 26th year of the existence of free Ukraine be a joyous year of its rebirth, after the expulsion of the enemy, back to the former quiet and happy life." (Metropolitan Nicholai of Kiev and Galicia, Dec. 20, 1942, 72, 74)

The Bolshevik priests took a leaf from the Church of Tsarism. When Ivan the Terrible emerged as one of the blackest figures in history, his ecclesiastical flunkey, Silvester, addressed him: "Your throne is confirmed by truth, strength and genuine justice . . . upon the Tsardom confirmed by God." Stalin's highest Church flunkey addressed his Master: "To Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin. On the 25th anniversary of the Soviet Republic, in the name of our clergy and all the faithful of the Orthodox Church, loyal offsprings of our fatherland, I cordially and prayingly greet in Your person the God-chosen Chief of our military and cultural forces, who is leading us toward victory over the barbarian invasion, toward peaceful flourishing of

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

our country and the bright future of its peoples. Let God bless with success and glory Your great heroism for the fatherland." (Telegram from Sergei, *Pravda,* Nov. 9, 1942; *Izvestia,* Nov. 10, 1942)

One of Stalin's own official communications to his Church read: "To the Patriarch Provisional Sergei Metropolitan of Moscow. I request the transmission to the Orthodox Russian clergy and to the faithful my greetings and the thanks of the Red Army for the care of the armored forces of the Red Army. Directives for the opening of a special account in the State Bank have been issued. J. Stalin." *(Pravda,* January 5, 1943)

Stalin strengthened the ideological power of his Church over the Russian masses in various ways. For example: "One of the three newly-created decorations for Soviet commanders is named after a canonized saint of the Church—Alexander Nevsky." (A. R. Williams, *Soviet Russia Today,* Oct. 1942)

Before the workers, Stalin's policy of furthering the expansion of his Church has been presented as an attitude of tolerance toward religion: "So last week Stalin gave a reception for the three Greek Orthodox Metropolitans, Leningrad's Bishop Alexis, the Ukraine's Archbishop Nicholas, Moscow's 76 year old Bishop Sergei . . . At this reception, says the Moscow Radio, the three Metropolitans 'informed' Stalin that the Orthodox Church intends to call a council of Bishops, elect a Patriarch of Moscow and form a Holy Synod. Said the Moscow radio: 'Comrade Stalin favorably considered these suggestions and stated there would be no obstacle on the part of the Government.'" *(Time,* Sept. 13, 1943, 45)

A tremendous impetus towards solidifying Christianity in the Marxist State was given by Stalin when on October 8, 1943 his Sovnarkom established a Soviet on Orthodox Affairs headed by a Bolshevik burocrat, G. G. Karpov. The cooperation of the Marxist State and its Left Christian Church was now systematized.

In May 1944 Sergei died. The Bolshevik press carried the announcement and a further indication of closeness of association of the Marxist State and its Church: "On the 18 of May this year in the Cathedral Patriarchem Bogoiavlensk Church in Moscow were held services and burial of the Holiest Patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia, Sergei . . . The funeral was attended by G. G. Karpov, the representative of the Sovnarkom of the USSR." *(Izvestia,* May 20, 1944). "In connection with the death of the holiest patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia, Sergei, the Soviet of People's Commissars of the USSR has expressed to the holiest Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church its profound condolence." *(Ib.)*

Stalin's newly-appointed head of the Left Christian Church immediately pledged devotion to the Marxist Dictator. The pledge was in the form of eulogy to the deceased:

"You knew well his love for the Fatherland, his patriotism which inspired him in the epoch of the trials of war. And we, his closest

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

assistants, knew of his feeling of sincerest love for You, loyalty to You as to the Wise, God-given Chief (this was his usual expression) of the peoples of our great Union. This feeling manifested itself with a particular force after his personal acquaintance with You, after our memorable meeting with You on the 4 of September last . . . Acting in full unity with the Soviet for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church, and together with the Holy Synod instituted by the deceased patriarch, I shall be safeguarded from errors and false steps.

"I beg of You, profoundly respected and dear Joseph Vissarionovich, to accept these assurances of mine with the same confidence with which I am making them and trust the feelings of profound love and gratitude towards You which inspire all the Church functionaries directed by me as of today. Alexei, Metropolitan of Leningrad and Kiev. Patriarch Provisional. May 20, 1944." *(Patriarch Sergei and his Spiritual Legacy,* R. 135-6)

Meantime a Left Christian atmosphere had spread in the schools among faculty members, as recorded in the Bolshevik press: "It is no use concealing the fact that among the teachers there are people, a small number it is true, who have recently begun to show tolerance toward religion. Cases of observance of religious ceremonies by teachers have even increased." *(Komsomolskaya Pravda,* Sep. 17, 1944)

When the rising bourgeoisie rebelled against the Catholic Church, the Vatican and the aristocracy created the impression that the new movement was opposed to all religion. Yet Voltaire built a church in his estate of Farne near Geneva for the peasants of his own village, while the dictator Robespierre invented a "revolutionary" religion of worship of the Supreme Being. Were there any signs that the Marxists before the establishment of the Bolshevik State had the idea of employing the Church as their agency? A Belgian Socialist Deputy wrote: "I do not regard the Church an irreconcilable enemy. History teaches us that the Church is flexible, it is always eager to accept the victor. In reality, she is hostile to Socialism because the capitalist is still supreme; tomorrow, if we triumph, she shall be our docile servant and will not have any difficulty in proving, by the fragments from the Evangels and quotations from her Fathers, that she is more Socialist than we and was that way before us." (Jules Destree, "Le Mouvement Socialiste," No. 107, Nov. 1, 1902, VIII, 1942, *Enquete Sur L'anticlericalisme et Le Socialisme,* III)

3. *Stalin Advancing Marxist Christian Reformation*

With the rise of the Bolshevik State, its rulers, to deceive the oppressed, introduced and have successfully maintained the delusion that Bolshevism stood opposed to all religions. This delusion has been strengthened by the ignorant or demagogic propaganda spread by Catholicism, Judaism and by various Protestant sects. In reality Bolshevism is opposed only to those Churches which, in serving the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

bourgeoisie, attack the Bolshevik State. Bolshevism is in favor of a Church—its own Church. The Marxist Reformed Church has been built to Bolshevik specifications. It rejects and anathematizes bourgeois private economy and all Churches which support Capitalism; it lauds and upholds the State form of economy and faithfully serves the burocracy.

The Bolsheviks are not building a Left Greek Orthodox Church to counterpose to Left Catholicism and Protestantism. Their Reformation has established a "new" Left Christianity which can, and is intended to, absorb any and all existing Left Christian sects. The "new" religion incorporates all the "proletarian" aspects of the Christ myth which are adaptable to Bolshevik demagogy: "Jesus the poor carpenter," "the primitive Christian Commune." The church that finds itself in the Bolshevik sphere of influence can survive only if it is adaptable and accepts the Marxist neo-Christianity, gives up support to the bourgeoisie and aligns itself with the new exploiting set of rulers. Here is a lucid exposition of the Bolshevik policy on this question by a leading American flunkey of Stalin: "But it would be contrary to its whole flexible history if the Church, once capitalism's battle is lost and Socialism is victorious, does not, with whatever difficulty, adapt itself to the conditions of the new Socialist regime. The Greek Orthodox Church, which also defended feudalism and capitalism to the very last ditch, is setting a pattern of adaptation which the Roman Catholic Church will very probably eventually have to follow." (William Z. Foster, *The New Europe,* 72)

In the Soviet Union's satellite countries the methods of persuasion used to win the clergy over to the Marxist Order have been basic. Apart from the physical persuasion which is not as thorough or lasting as political-economic pressure and bribery—the Marxist burocracy has employed the same method used by the early bourgeoisie in its Reformation struggles against the Roman Church which before the bourgeoisie secured power supported Feudalism:

"In a recent speech, George Dimitrov, Premier of Bulgaria, said: 'Respecting the religious feelings of the faithful, the government will continue to give material aid to the Church and the clergy until it becomes self-supporting.' " *(Ib.)*

"In 1939 the new Soviet Republic of Lithuania gave officiating priests . . . a certain number of acres from the land fund." (Albert Rhys Williams, "Religion in the USSR," *Soviet Russia Today,* Oct. 1942)

That the Marxist State system *must* have a Church, a Left *Christian* Church, has been openly indicated by Zdenek Fierlinger, Stalin's puppet Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia. Calling the Stalin program "not only socialistic but also truly Christian," he declared: "in this program we need the Church which cannot afford to be a strange body within the state." (Cited in *N. Y. Post,* Jan. 19, 1951)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The building of the Marxist Neo-Christian Church in Stalinist Czechoslovakia has been proceeding systematically:

"The first Czechoslovak Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church to swear allegiance to the Communist Government in Prague is now ordaining priests who have been graduated from religious seminaries approved by the regime. This was disclosed today in a lengthy article on 'The Role of the Church in a Popular Democracy' by Zdenek Fierlinger, Vice Premier of Czechoslovakia, which appeared in the current issue of 'Parallel 50,' a well-known Communist propaganda journal."

"Antonin Eltschkner, 71-year-old Bishop of Zephyrium and Auxiliary to Archbishop Josef Beran of Prague, swore an oath of loyalty before Justice Minister Alexei Cepicka, a Communist stalwart, on Feb. 18, 1950" *(N. Y. Times,* Feb. 22, 1951)

Stalin's Neo-Christian policy has embraced not only the old Christian countries but has extended also to the predominantly and historically non-Christian countries like China:

"The various local governments of North China—Communist led—declare that they protect freedom of religion . . . In some cases local Communist-controlled governments have given subsidies to foreign missionary orphanages or hospitals to enable to keep going . . . 'There are both good and bad priests', concluded the tolerant Communist K'e." ("Red China and Catholic Missions" by Anna Louise Strong, *The Protestant,* Aug.-Sept. 1947, 18-21)

"Since the Sino-Japanese War there has been a crescendo of silence concerning the numerous instances of Chinese Communists inviting the Christian Church to work in their areas, and of friendly relations between the churches and Communist authorities." *(Ib.* Feb. 1949, 16)

E. L. Smith, a mission executive, has indicated that in China under the Stalinist regime " 'Christianity lives and even grows . . . In the colleges . . . religious subjects permitted in the curriculum if not made compulsory.' " *(N. Y. T.,* Dec. 11, 1950)

The struggle which began in the Lenin period in Russia between the Churches agencies of Capitalism and the Neo-Christian Marxist Church agency of the Bolshevik State has found expression also in the Marxist satellite countries including China: "HONG KONG, May 26. —The Chinese Communist News Agency said today Msgr. Anthony Riberi, apostolic internuncio of the Holy See in Nanking, had been accused of blocking the 'patriotic movement' among the Chinese people. The phrase, 'patriotic movement,' refers to Chinese Communist efforts to convert Chinese Catholics to the support of a state-controlled church." *(N. Y. World-Telegram,* May 26, 1951)

Incidentally, it should be noted that the basic planting of Christianity in China (French Jesuits, 1582) brought with it the inevitable root-story that the founder of Christianity had been tortured and murdered by the Jews. However, the dominant powers of China for

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

centuries opposed the spreading of the Christian doctrine. History left it to the new rulers, the Chinese Stalinists, to pursue a policy of building a Marxist Christian Church in China, by force if necessary, and thus attempt to spread the root-story among the entire Chinese population.

4. *The Policy of Left Christianism in the Comintern*

Left Christianism in the early period of the Comintern was incidental. The early American Bolsheviks formed a Marxian Institute and popularized such works as Harry Waton's *The Philosophy of Marx*. The endorsement of the book read: "Comrade Waton has in this book rendered an inestimable service to the Socialist movement by crystallizing the differences between revolutionary Socialism and the opportunism of the Second International." (7) Waton's boost to Church demagogy read as follows: "One may be an atheist, one may hate religion; nevertheless, everyone cannot help perceive that Christianity is an ideal religion embodying a sublime conception of the universal brotherhood of man—a religion which can realize itself only in a state of Communism." (170). A Jewish American Bolshevik wrote:

"Jesus suffered and died for something He believed good; He was not a verbose, tricky journalist, a successful parson, a cunning exploiter of labour, or even a politician, and for this we must respect Him. For His age Jesus was undoubtedly an innocent and beautiful poetical voice of all that is best in the emotions of the animal Man; we can love Him for that, as we love Shelley and Whitman. We have all of us His tender child-hunger in our veins, that makes us dream of a simple and gentle world, where there is no strife, where all is mild and fraternal, and where men are as little children . . . The legend of Lenin is more beautiful to me than the legend of Jesus. A strong practical man with a heart as pure as that of Jesus leads great masses to emancipation." (Michael Gold, *The Communist Review*, Oct. 1922, 303-305; *The Liberator*, Sept. 1922, 1)

In the above we call the reader's attention to Michael Gold's Church style of capitalizing "He," "His" and "Him" in reference to the mythical Jesus.

British Bolsheviks gave a Left color to the Crucifixion theme: "How truly it has been said that Christ died upon the Cross in order that Church dignitaries might live upon it." (William Paul, *The Communist Review*, June 1923). "The C.P. in the Communist of June 11, 1921 published a series of cartoons by Espoir on 'The Return of Christ,' viewing Christ as a champion of the workers against the rich rulers in the Church and State who, because of his violent revolutionary challenge, was condemned to death by the Social-Fascist Labour Party (The Pharisees) in alliance with the capitalist imperialist state." ("Can a Christian be a Communist?" by Jack Bucknell, *Ib.* June 1930)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In the later stages of the Comintern the distinct policy of deliberate dissemination of Left Christianism is fairly obvious. This basically anti-Semitic opium has been fed to the workers by the highest functionaries of the Comintern. The line was often buttressed with citations from Engels. The General Secretary of the Communist Party of France declared:

"Engels, in his contribution to the *History of Christianity,* published in 1885, wrote: 'The history of Primitive Christianity offers some remarkable parallels with the modern working class movement. Like the latter Christianity in its beginning was the movement of the oppressed, it appeared first of all as the religion of the slaves and freed slaves, of the poor and the men without rights, of the peoples subjugated or scattered by Rome. Both of them, Christianity like working class Socialism, preach the coming deliverance from slavery and misery; Christianity transfers this deliverance to the next world, to a life after death, in heaven; Socialism places it in this world, in a transformation of society. Both are pursued and hunted, their adherents are proscribed and put under exceptional laws in one case as enemies of the human race, in the other as enemies of government, of religion, of the family, of social order. And in spite of all persecutions and even assisted by them, both movements force their way on victoriously and irresistibly.'

"The progressive role of Christianity appears again later in its endeavor towards the organization of charity, of solidarity, in the attempt to make the relations between men in the feudal epoch more just and more peaceful, in the solicitude of the religious communities —Communist groups in aim, fact and action—which took upon themselves the mission of preserving, developing and handing down to future ages the sum of human knowledge and the artistic treasures of the past. Who can call to mind without a throb of emotion the centuries which saw the spires of our wonderful cathedrals rise toward the sky, these pure jewels of a people's art, which proclaim with every one of their ancient stones—which live for those who can understand them—against the legend of the gloomy Middle Ages." (Maurice Thorez, *Catholics and Communists,* Workers Library Publishers, 1938, 11)

One of the editors of the French Stalin paper *L'Humanite* defined the attitude of the Marxists toward Left Christian tendencies: "The Marxists regard with sympathy the effort of these Christians who want to liberate their Church from certain material servitude and find in their faith and in the shining past of their Apostles an original foundation for an action which can be joined together with that of the fighters for Socialism." (Pierre Herve, *La Liberation Trahie,* 72)

Earl Browder, when he was General Secretary of the American Section of the Comintern, recorded that—". . . an increasing number of Party members are active communicants of the various churches, finding in the Party program and activities, as distinct from its back-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ground and base of Marxian philosophy, what they themselves describe as 'the nearest we can find to applied Christianity.'" *(Religion and Communism,* 1939, 7)

The Stalin publishing house in the United States, the International Publishers, put out the *Speeches of Wilhelm Liebknecht.* In a speech he delivered in May 1872 Liebknecht declared:

"We live in a country in which Christianity is the state religion; we face judges and jurors who accept Christianity; did not Christ himself, according to tradition, address himself chiefly to the impoverished? Is it not the principal merit of Christianity, in so far as it has not been degraded to the service of unholy national and class purposes, that it burst asunder the narrow-hearted nationalism of the Hebrews and substituted for it the idea of a universal humanity, i.e. in modern words, the principal of internationalism? I do not want any one to think that I am a Christian—but a state, a society, which calls itself 'Christian' has in truth no right to cast a stone at aspirations which are in harmony with the fundamental teachings of Christianity and have as their goal the realization of all these teachings, their translation from empty words into real life." (54)

The Christ myth has been presented by the popular Stalin publications as historically authentic, painted in "Left" colors as usual:

"Jesus was, of course, a radical in terms of his own society. He was an anti-imperialist and sided, in general, with the oppressed and exploited classes. In his conflict with the Pharisees and Sadducees he represented the majority interests against the entrenched minority. His system of ethics, although its basis was primarily eschatological, was largely an instrument for social justice." (R. H. Rovere, a review of *The Life of Jesus,* by Conrad Noel, *New Masses,* Feb. 15, 1938, 23)

5. *Bolshevik Shielding and Dissemination of Anarchist Left Christianism*

The Marxists often fused with the Anarchists organizationally and even more often collaborated with them politically. And on the issue of anti-Semitism and Left Christianism there was hardly any difference between the two movements. Bakunin spoke of—"the coarse, self-seeking and cruel personality of Jehova, the national god of the Jews, who at the same time was three in one. Meanwhile, despite their exclusively national spirit which distinguishes them even in the present time, the Jews became factually long before the birth of Christ the most international people in the world . . . urged on by that mercantile passion which constitutes one of their main characteristics also in our day. They thereby spread everywhere the worship of Jehova to whom the more true they were the more he abandoned them. In Alexandria the terrible god of the Jews blended with the metaphysical divinity of Plato; this resulted in the creation of a senseless, neither material nor at the same time a spiritual God of the Christians.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

In order to lend a coloration of life to this newly invented religion and make it popular in the wide layers of the people there was required a living, self-creative fact, a realistic image of a prophet to whom the new teaching could be attached . . . And what was sought for was found: that was the teaching, suffering and death of Jesus Christ. We don't know anything factually reliable about this person; everything told us by the Gospel is so contradictory, so fable-like that we can hardly find in it several realistic and living features. But there is no doubt that he was a teacher of the poor, a friend and comforter of the unfortunate, ignorant people, of slaves and women and that these loved him very much. He was crucified like a criminal by the representatives of the official morals and order of that age. His disciples and the disciples of these disciples successfully (thanks to the Roman conquests and the destruction of boundaries) spread and taught the Gospel in all the countries known to the Ancients. Everywhere slaves and women, the most oppressed, most suffering and therefore most ignorant classes of the Ancient World met them with open arms . . . This was the first considerable revolt of the proletariat." *(God and the State,* R. 119, 120, 121)

The Bolshevik teachers and historians could not have failed to detect Left Christianism in Bakunin. But their mind was fixed on Marx who, after all, accepted Bakunin into the International. Therefore they were impelled to lie: "The teachings of Bakunin can be designated as militant atheism." *(Les. Sov. Enc.* I, 554)

Another eminent Anarchist leader was Peter Kropotkin. In 1922 the Bolshevik State printed his *Ethics* which, like Bakunin's work, combined Left Christian and anti-Semitic features:

"In the case of Christianity the love of the divine teacher for men—for all men without distinction of nation or condition, and especially for the lowest—led to the highest heroic sacrifice—to death on the cross for the salvation of humanity from the power of evil.

"Instead of a fear of a revengeful Jehova, or of gods personifying the evil forces of nature, the Christians advocated love for the victims of oppression, and the moral teacher in Christianity was not a revengeful deity, not a priest, not a man of the priestly caste, and even not a thinker from among the sages, but a simple man from the people . . . a carpenter who left his house and his kin, and lived as 'the birds of heaven' live, in expectation of the approaching 'Day of judgment . . .'

"Another fundamental feature of Christianity, which was the chief source of its strength, was the fact that it advanced as the leading principle of man's life not his personal happiness, but the *happiness of society*—and consequently an ideal, a *social ideal,* for which a man would be ready to sacrifice his life (see, for example, the tenth and the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel of St. Mark)." (R. 91)

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER XXI.

THE BOLSHEVIK STATE SUSTAINS THE SYMBOL OF CRUCIFIXION, ADOPTS THE CHRISTIAN ANTI-SEMITIC CALENDAR

1. *Lenin's Policy With Respect to the Cross Emblem*

ALTHOUGH IN the pre-Christian Era many peoples used the cross as a religious or an ornamental object, with the rise and growth of Christianity the cross became universally regarded, primarily if not exclusively, as the symbol of the Christian religion. It could not have been otherwise because the central theme of Christianity is the Crucifixion, and "the death of Christ on a cross necessarily conferred a new significance to the figure . . ." *(Enc. Br.* VII, 506). There was no other feature involved in the adoption of the cross as the symbol of Christianity except the feature of the mythical Crucifixion—"A representation of the cross as the symbol of Christ's death . . ." *(Webster's,* 630)

Of all the Christian countries, Tsarist Russia had the most lavish display of crosses, and while the sight of the cross gladdened the heart of every reactionary from the Tsar and Pobedonostsev down, it aroused revulsion among the most advanced workers. The revolutionary sailors detested the sight of the cross, particularly of St. Andrew's cross. This was due not so much to the fact that St. Andrew was adopted as patron saint of Russia *(Cath. Enc.* I, 471) but to the fact that the Tsar's Navy flew the St. Andrew's cross as a flag. A reference book of the Tsarist days gives an adequate description of this cross: "Andrew's Cross. An oblique cross in the form of the letter X; according to tradition, the first named Apostle, Andrew, was crucified on such a cross. Andrew's cross has been respected from time immemorial because it has been simultaneously viewed as a symbol of the name of Christ (Greek X)." *(New Enc. Dict.* II, R. 797. St. Petersburg, 1911-1916)

After the overthrow of the Tsar, the revolutionary sailors substituted the red flag for Andrew's cross. Kerensky did not dare remove the red flag even after the July Days. When Lenin, during the Brest period, succeeded in wiping out the sailors' democracy and in imposing upon them his appointive system of command, something interesting occurred with respect to the old St. Andrew's flag. Lenin, as we recall, withdrew the big naval units from Finland. Command over the remaining craft was given to A. P. Zeleny, whom Trotsky, on the next day, entrusted "to enter into negotiations with the White Guardist Government of Finland." *(Civil War, Actions on Seas,* etc., R. II, 46-47. Leningrad, 1926). Evidently Zeleny received secret instructions from the Bolshevik regime to remove the red flag, obviously as a gesture to the Finnish White Guard Government. At that time the massacre of the Finnish advanced workers was commenced and Zeleny effected a psychological separation between the Bolshevik sailors under his command and the Finnish workers who fought under the red

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

flag. Zeleny ordered the display of the St. Andrew's Cross. Lenin, Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders knew that this cross had been used by the most reactionary forces in history. For example, it was displayed on the battle flag of the Confederate slaveholders. Lenin and his partners were keenly conscious of the fact that their fleet was flying the naval flag of the Tsar. The Bolshevik historians offer the following excuse: "On the 12 of April the St. Andrew's flag was raised on all ships (in view of the fact that the red flag of the central Government of the Soviet Republic had been introduced as the naval flag to replace the Andrew flag, and was therefore not recognized by the governments of the foreign powers)." *(Civil War,* etc. 46)

Bolshevik ships in the Black Sea at certain moments also reintroduced the St. Andrew's cross. However, Lenin made no official use of this Christian emblem in his Fleet. It was necessary to preserve a red front before the sailors and the advanced masses, especially in view of the fact that the White Guards hoisted the St. Andrew's flag on whatever naval vessels they possessed. Lenin used the emblem in the Finnish emergency. Nevertheless he retained the four crosses in the Red Fleet's marine code, two of them St. Andrew's.

Lenin's settling in the Kremlin had, in addition to the Russian-nationalist, a distinctly Christian aspect. The imperial eagle on the plates on whch he ate bore the figure of St. Andrew's Order on the Moscow coat-of-arms and the crown surmounted with the cross. Crosses and eagles were met at every turn and seen overhead in every direction of the compass. It was not until 1937 that Stalin made a "revolutionary" change by substituting stars for the eagles *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* "Kremlin," XXXIV, 717-8). A Left bourgeois clergyman, sympathetic to the Stalin Government, observed the "strange" combination of Marxism and the cross in the Bolshevik State and drew the following conclusion: "To sum up: the place of Religion and Marxist philosophy in the life of the Soviet Union can, I think, best be illustrated by the fact that over the central seat of Government, the Kremlin, there shine two highly significant symbols, which can be seen from all directions, the Red Stars and the Golden Crosses." (Rev. W. A. Oyler, "Religion and the Soviet People," *Anglo-Soviet Journal,* VII, #4, 1946, 20)

Another feature indicating Lenin's policy of sanctioning the use of the symbol of Crucifixion by the Bolshevik State is connected with the organization of a medical service for his Army. The great Christian powers had established an ambulance and hospital service for their armies (1864) and adopted for its emblem a so-called badge of neutrality, the Geneva cross, with the colors reversed, a red cross on a white field. Turkey and Persia, however, declined to accept this emblem, as noted by the Bolshevik historians: "The coinciding of this sign with the religious Christian emblem induced the non-Christian countries (Turkey, Persia) to adopt the crescent and the image of the lion and the sun as a distinct sign of medical service." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XXX, 631-2). During the War of 1914-18 the Zionists, though sup-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

porting Christian powers, rejected the Geneva cross, recognizing in it the symbol of Christianity, and adopted the Hebrew Star of David—"Red Magin David, a medical aid organization which was formed during the First World War. Like the Red Cross and the Red Crescent, it had as its purpose the providing of medical assistance. In Palestine it worked mainly among the members of the Jewish Legion." *(Univ. J. Enc.* IX, 96)

Lenin, of course, had at his disposal numerous emblems that bore no resemblance to the cross; he certainly could have instructed the "Soviet" artists to submit some designs for a proletarian-looking emblem for the medical service. But Lenin chose a symbol described by the Bolshevik historians in these words: "The cross, one of the chief symbols and fetishes of the Christians." *(Gr. S. Enc.* XXX, 751). The "Soviet Red Cross" was officially constituted in 1918, and later, still under Lenin, it became connected with the Red Cross of the Christian bourgeois powers: "On the 20 of November 1918 the first general assembly of the Russian Association of the Red Cross was convoked and the first Soviet Red Cross was formed. In 1921 the already reorganized Russian Association of the Red Cross established relations with the International Committee of the Red Cross." (633). During all the years of the Civil War the Red cross, the symbol of Saint George and of the Crusaders, accompanied the Sovnarkom's armed forces. In Bolshevik towns crosses were painted on the buildings occupied by the "Soviet" medical service. The traditional sign of Christianity imperceptibly made a deep inroad into the confused psychology of the masses. Lenin's policy was to make the masses not only strongly Russian-patriotic but also cross-minded. The "Soviet" poetry in the period of Lenin's Sovnarkom fairly bristled with crosses —in most cases containing an allusion to the story that the Jews tortured and murdered the supposed founder of the Christian religion. That this line, just as the line of turning the Russian masses into Dostoevsky worshippers, was prompted from the top by the Lenin ruling circles, is fairly obvious. Thus, Lenin's chief of the Commissariat of Education declared: "If Dostoevsky were to resurrect, he, of course, would have found an ample amount of truthful and sufficiently bright colors to make us feel the whole necessity of the deed we are performing and the full sanctity of the cross which we are bearing on our shoulders." (Lunacharsky, "Dostoevsky as an Artist and Thinker," speech at "the commemoration of the hundredth anniversary of the birth of F. M. Dostoevsky," *Krasnaya Nov.* #4, Nov., Dec. 1921, 211)

Lenin's policy of saturating the mind of the Russian masses with Christian ideology becomes even more manifest when the fact is brought to light that Dostoevsky used Christian ideology against what was viewed as revolutionary trends—a fact recorded by the Bolshevik historians: "One of the chief weapons Dostoevsky utilized in this struggle was Christian ideology." *(Gr. S. Enc.* XXIII, 340)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

There was a special reason why Lenin chose precisely Dostoevsky as one of the most important assets of the Bolshevik Neo-Christianization policy. In the figure of Dostoevsky were combined several features which answered some of Lenin's basic requirements: Great Russian nationalism, strongly outspoken anti-Semitism and Christian ideology, all extremely important in the task of building the Bolshevik Church. Dostoevsky was useful to Lenin from another aspect. Since Lenin and his disciples aimed to overthrow eventually the entire international bourgeoisie and bring the whole world under their Russian Marxist power, and since the powerful Catholic and Protestant Churches as well as the Synagogue were supporting the international bourgeoisie, Dostoevsky's Russian-Christian ideology was of great value to Lenin: "The attitude of Fiodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821-81), one of the most celebrated writers of the 19th cent., toward Jews and Judaism was determined by the fact that he wished to make Christianity the foundation of the life of the individual and of the state. Christianity, to him, was realized in its purest form in the Russian Orthodox Church. This made Dostoevsky an enemy of both Catholicism and Protestanism, and to an even greater extent of European secular culture, which he rejected as godless and materialistic." *(Univ. J. Enc.* III, 591). If we add the fact that "Dostoevsky emerged as one of the chief conveyers of the idea of Panslavism in the public Russian consciousness." *(Russ. Biog. Dict.* R. VI, 667, St. Petersburg, 1905), we can clearly see what ideological diet the Lenin ring was feeding the Russian masses. The Lenin ring was facilitated in its policy on Dostoevsky by the memory of Dostoevsky's early adherence to Fourierist circles (1847-9), his terrible years in Siberian exile and his subsequent popularity as an "educator" and "advanced" writer. This provided Lenin with a hazy "revolutionary" cloak for Dostoevsky in promoting Russian-Christian and crass anti-Semitic ideas among the masses.

With respect to the establishment of the Bolshevik Red Cross, the Russian masses and even the advanced Comintern workers received the false impression that this institution was to operate solely as a relief and medical aid department, that the cross emblem merely happened to coincide with the basic symbol of Christianity. The trick of separating the sign of the cross from its actual historical denotation is indicated in the phrase, "The *coinciding* of this sign with the religious Christian emblem . . ." *(G. Sov. Enc.* XXX, 631. Our emph.—G. S.) That the "Soviet Red Cross," while doing its hospital and relief work, has also been inculcating Christian ideology in the mind of the Russian masses will be revealed in the course of our review of the central and basic feature in Lenin's Neo-Christian policy.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

2. *Marxist Emotional and Glory Attachment to the Symbol of Crucifixion*

We have shown that Marxist literature is replete with passages that give authenticity to the Church mythology and therefore to the Crucifixion. We may add an example from Trotsky and one from Mehring. Trotsky, evidently likening Lenin to "Christ," Stalin to "Judas," and the Trotsky leaders to the "apostles," wrote: "Of Christ's twelve apostles, Judas alone proved to be a traitor. But if he had acquired power, he would have represented the other eleven apostles as traitors, and also all the lesser apostles, whom Luke numbers as seventy." *(Stalin,* 416). Mehring wrote: "On Good Friday, 1855, Marx's only son . . . died." *(Karl Marx,* 274). Mehring could have, of course, given the calendar date; instead he gave the day which recalled to mind the story of the Crucifixion.

Marx, as we remember, gave historicity to the mythical Christ. It is only logical that to people who are emotionally attached to Christianity the symbol of Crucifixion is an object of a mixed feeling of sadness and affection. In Marx's ideology the cross was an accepted emblem, and in his family one particular cross an object of honor. Writing to Kugelmann on February 11, 1869, Marx said: "The cross which my oldest daughter, Jenny, is wearing in the photograph is a Polish insurrection cross of 1864." In a photograph taken by Marx with his daughter in 1870 she wears a huge cross, as big as commonly worn by nuns. The Marxist burocrats frequently displayed this photograph of Marx and his daughter. The Bolshevik State has often reproduced the photograph. It can be found, for example, in *Literaturnoe Nasledstvo,* 1933, #7-8, 11. What animated the Marx family in this cross was its supposedly revolutionary content. However, the reactionary nature of the 1863-1864 Polish insurrection is embodied in the political-economic character of its landlord leadership.

We have cited Lenin's State policy with respect to the symbol of the Crucifixion. Before the seizure of power, in light of one of his letters in 1895, Lenin had a family closeness to the cross. That he was then already a mature Marxist is seen from his political record: "In 1895 Lenin united all the Marxist workers' circles in St. Petersburg (there were already about twenty of them) into a single League of Struggle for the Emancipation of the Working Class. He thus prepared the way for the founding of a revolutionary Marxist workers' party." *(Hist. of C.P.S.U.* 16). In the same year Lenin reported to his mother that the cross on the grave of his deceased sister was in good repair. "Shortly after I arrived I visited the Volkov Cemetery. Everything is in good condition there, the cross and the wreath." (Oct. 17, 1895. *Letters to Relatives,* R. 10)

Under Stalin the cross, in addition to its purely Christian-emotional side, assumed the sentimental aspect so valued by Marx in the cross worn by his daughter. It became a means of inducing in indi-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

vidual an undemocratic, abnormal sense of elevation over other people. Thus, Stalin's Polish puppet, Bierut, bestowed a cross on a person who evidently rendered service to Stalin! "Dr. Paul Neff Garber, Methodist Bishop for the European area, was awarded the Commander's Cross, high Polish decoration, for his services in organizing the Methodist Church in Poland. The decoration was conferred by President Bierut at a special audience in Warsaw." (*The Protestant*, March-April 1948, 21)

3. *What is a Calendar*

In a society built on oppression and deception of the masses by a privileged minority the whole fabric regulating the daily life bears the ideological imprint of the interests of this minority. Let us take several examples. City streets are not only physical means for passage: they carry the ideology of the rulers, are named after many of them or after people whose ideas furnish support to the dominant group. Each profound change in the composition of the ruling forces is reflected on the streets and other physical objects. Following the elimination of Trotsky from power there was a widespread renaming of streets, buildings, historical sites connected with the Civil War and the October Revolution, trains, ships, towns. Circulating money, too, is not only a medium of exchange; each coin and bill represents the ideology of the ruling elements. Language is not only a means of conveying or concealing ideas, it is also a means of coloring ideas. The privileged, oppressing Bolshevik minority never conducted a policy of eliminating the numerous religious and specifically Christian expressions which during the past centuries had accumulated in the tongue of Tsarist Russia and which, due to the lack of that policy, the masses continued using after the Revolution. Consciously, or by its reactionary ideological inclination, the Bolshevik minority itself has been employing these expressions and thereby promoting the perpetuation of their use. One finds them in Lenin's writings. Thus: "For God's sake, try to get all this into Petrograd . . . For God's sake, make every effort to forward . . ." ("Letter to J. S. Hanecki," *C. W.* XX, B I, 72). "God grant that we retreat in perfect order." (Report at the Seventh Congress of the R.C.P. March 7, 1918). "For God's sake, immediately a conference of the Lefts . . ." (Lenin to the Foreign Buro of the C.C. Aug.-Sep. 1917. *Len. Sb.* XIII, 280). ". . . and thank God we can move about on crutches!" (Report at the Tenth Congress of the R.C.P. March 15, 1921). "God grant that we manage . . ." (Speech at Congress of Political Education, Oct. 17, 1921)

Even in scientific fields the religious terms and symbols have been retained by the Bolshevik State. In astronomy, for example, the name Southern Cross, the Greek cross within a circle representing the astronomical symbol for the earth, numerous signs representing Greek, Roman and other deities have been retained.

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

T = Mozilla/5.0
HTTP_ACCEPT-

In a society founded to promote the interests of an oppressive minority, a calendar is not just an instrument systematically dividing and reckoning time but is one of the subtly powerful means of influencing mass ideology. Every such calendar is religious in origin and application. "The ancient Saxons had borrowed the week from some Eastern nation, and substituted the names of their own divinities for those of the gods of Greece." *(Enc. Br. "Calendar,"* IV, 988). Each day in the calendar is consecrated to some particular events or persons connected with the establishment of the power of the particular minority or to somebody whose ideas are useful in maintaining this power. The era of a minority-rule calendar starts with some arbitrary event, usually invented. The Jewish Era is reckoned from the mythical creation of the earth by a supernatural being. This period, which coincides with the Pharaonic history of Egypt, is hundreds of millions of years after the actual evolutionary formation of the globe: "The Creation (calculated by Jewish scholars to have taken place in the fall of 3761 B. C. E.)." *(Univ. Jewish Enc.* II, 632). The Jewish "scholars," adopting this fiction for their calendar in the Fifteenth Century of the Christian Era, were steeped in ignorance; but the modern Jewish bourgeois "thinkers" who have been upholding this fiction in the face of the discoveries of the science of geology regarding the age of the earth have obviously been peddling a deliberate fraud.

Christianity for centuries used various non-Christian calendars. In the Sixth Century Abbot Dionysius adjusted the pagan calendar of Julius Caesar to the Church's needs and established the Christian chronology. The Christian calendar, reformed by Pope Gregory XIII in 1582 ("New Style"), played a powerful role in fixing the Church ideology in the mind of the expanding Christian population.

4. *The Dechristianization Attempt by the Left Idealists of the French Revolution*

Since the Christian religion became pre-eminent in Europe, Christianity, under the impact of political, economic and military forces, underwent numerous schisms and explosions, yet for over a thousand years not one of these crises threatened the eradication of Christianity in any of the Christian States—until the French Revolution. To be sure this social upheaval was bourgeois in class character yet it produced some Left idealists who not only assailed the religious tradition of the old regime but actually set out to dechristianize France. For the first time in history a movement sprang up to terminate the Christian Era. The movement, interestingly enough, began not in Paris but in the provinces. "The first example of dechristianization was given by a little village commune . . ." (Alphonse Aulard, *Christianstvo i Frantsuzskaia Revolutsia,* 62. Moscow, 1925). The movement swept over France like a cyclone. The central feature of the dechris-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

zilla/5.0
ACCEPT-

tianization was the adoption of an anti-Christian, anti-religious calendar, by the Convention on October 5, 1793 of the Christian Era. "The point of departure of the anti-religious revolution was the institution of the Republican Calendar, which M. Aulard characterized correctly as 'the most anti-Christian measure which the Convention adopted.' " (Albert Mathiez, *La Revolution et L'Eglise,* 74). This was not merely a new Reformation, not a move directed only against the Catholic Church but against all Churches. "The idea of turning France Protestant . . . was altogether alien to the leading revolutionists and to the people." (Aulard, 66-7). As the *Catholic Encyclopedia* correctly points out, "This calendar was a product of the revolt against Christianity." (IV, 28)

The Decree establishing the anti-Christian calendar was the fruition of a struggle that had gone on for many months. The revolutionary idealists had opened a powerful offensive against the "New Style" of Pope Gregory XIII. Those who were reluctant to abandon it were assailed with logical arguments and with taunts. "Gorsas commented sarcastically: 'They did not wish to disturb the *old plan* of Pope Gregory, of that vicar of God who did not blush to have a medal struck commemorating Saint Bartholomew's Day!' " (Geo. G. Andrews, *American Historical Review,* April 1931, 520). For a while, before the new Decree was adopted, both the Christian and the anti-Christian dates were employed. However some Left publications had begun to discard the Christian chronology. The January 2, 1790 issue of Proudhomme's journal, *Revolutions de Paris,* over three years before the Decree, was dated: "Seconde annee de la liberte francaise." (Andrews, 517). All sorts of ideas as to what kind of a calendar should be adopted were advanced. One almanac declared: "The calendar of the French Republic . . . must not resemble in any respect the official annals of the apostolic and Roman Church." (525)

In the Report to the Convention on the introduction of the anti-Christian calendar, G. Romme stated: "Among all peoples, the calendar has been a powerful Talisman which the priests have always been able to use successfully to subdue the numerous class of the weak-willed. Each month, each day, each hour offers new deceptions to their credulity." *(Journal Des Debats et Des Decrets* No. 389, Oct. 1-21, 1793, 84)

Romme explained why the names of the months must be changed: "On the nomenclature of the French calendar the names recall either tyrannical oppressors of their country, such as, January, July, August; or some gods of the Romans or Etruscans, such as February, March, May . . . This nomenclature is obviously a monument of servitude and ignorance, to which the peoples have successively added an impression of their degradation . . . We propose a new nomenclature to you which is neither celestial nor mysterious; it is drawn entirely from our revolution of which it presents either the principal events, or the aims, or the means." (80-1)

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

T = Mozilla/5.0
e HTTP_ACCEPT-

Fabre D'Eglantine, reporting for the Calendar Commission, stated: "The regeneration of the French people, the establishment of the Republic has necessarily involved the reform of the vulgar era. We can no longer count the years when kings oppressed us as a time when we have lived, the prejudice of the Crown and Church, the deception of one and the other sullied each page of the calendar we used. You have changed this calendar; you have substituted for it another where time is measured by more exact and symmetrical calculations. But that is not sufficient. A protracted use of the Gregorian calendar has filled the memory of the people with a considerable number of images which they have respected for a long time and which are still today the source of its religious errors; we must therefore substitute for these visions of ignorance the realities of reason, and for priestly prestige the truth of nature." (Buchez and Roux: *Histoire Parlementaire de la Revolution Francaise,* 1793-1794, XXXI, 415. Cited in part by R. Lamont in *Popular Astronomy,* Oct. 1920). "The priests had assigned to each day of the year the commemoration of a so-called saint; this catalogue has neither utility nor method; it was the repertoire of deceit, dupery and charlatanism. We thought that the nation, after having driven the canonized ones from its calendar, ought to put in their place all the objects of which the true national wealth consists; the worth while objects . . . the useful produce of the earth, the tools which we use to cultivate it, and the domesticated animals, our faithful servants in this work, animals far more precious doubtless to the eyes of reason than the beatified skeletons drawn from the Rome catacombs." (423). "The arts and history, for which time is a necessary element, require also a new measure of time, rid of all the errors which crudility and a superstitious routine have transmitted through centuries of ignorance to the present." (430)

"On November 7, 1793, Gobel, the Bishop of Paris, and his chief ecclesiastics appeared in the Convention and solemnly abjured the Christian faith. This action was emulated by many of the sections of Paris." (Shaller Mathews, *The French Revolution,* 245). Several days later, "on the 23 of Brumaire the Protestants of Paris joined the movement." (Aulard, 65)

While dechristianization won thousands of converts daily, the leaders of this movement were not really atheists but were ultra-Left deists seeking to create a religion of "reason." The petty-bourgeois dictator Robespierre, standing to the Right of the dechristianizers, employing pretense with the masses and intrigue against his opponents, intended to sabotage the introduction of the anti-Christian calendar: "Robespierre had already taken alarm at the decree of October 5 instituting the new calendar, and made an entry in his memorandum-book as follows: 'Indefinite adjournment of the decree on the calendar'—which shows he intended to oppose the execution of the law which was to serve as a pretext for dechristianization." (Mathiez, *The French Revolution,* 387)

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
P_ACCEPT-

"Meantime the Government, i.e. the Committee of Public Safety quietly counter-acted this movement. Robespierre harshly attacked it, and when Cloots came into the Committee and enthusiastically told about the abjuration of Gobel, Robespierre harshly expressed his dissatisfaction." (P. Kropotkin, *The Great French Revolution,* R. 523. Moscow-Leningrad, 1922). Meanwhile, another Rightist figure, Danton, "married in Church." *(Ib.)*

The swing back to Christianity took place under Robespierre shortly after the introduction of the anti-Christian calendar. "In the middle of Frimaire Robespierre, utilizing the support of Danton, decided to act and on the 16 (December 6) he demanded that the Committee of Public Safety issue a decree of freedom of worship . . . from this day Catholicism triumphed. Everybody understood that Robespierre took it under his wing. Catholicism once more became the State Church." (Kropotkin, 525)

Robespierre framed up his anti-Christian opponents including Gobel: "The followers of Hebert, who were then pursuing their anti-Christian policy, claimed Gobel as one of themselves. Robespierre found him an obstacle to his religious schemes and involved him in the fate of the Hebertists. Gobel was condemned to death, with Chaumette, Hebert and Anacharsis Cloots, and guillotined on April 12, 1794." *(Enc. Brit.* 1947, X, 458)

The process of stabilizing the bourgeois system was soon marked by the execution of Robespierre himself (9 of Thermidor—27 of July 1794). The march to the Right, the abolition of dechristianization steadily gained momentum. "The signs of reaction daily became unmistakable. Worshippers crowded to the churches." *(Enc. Br.* XI, 166). After the Thermidorian regime came The Directory which moved further to the Right. Yet all this clearing of the road for a normal bourgeois Christian society in France proceeded under the cover of the use of the anti-Christian calendar: "The Directory issued, first of all, a number of laws and decisions on the strict observance of the Republican Calendar to the absolute exclusion of the use of the old Christian calendar in any form whatsoever." (Aulard, 94)

5. *Lenin Introduces a Calendar for the Bolshevik State*

In the first months after the establishment of the Sovnarkom, Lenin issued a great number of decrees, some of great importance, others of a petty burocratic organizational nature, such as the appointment of a self-seeking adventurer or his replacement with another adventurer. All the decrees were dated according to the Dionysian-Julian Christian Calendar used under the Tsar. At length, three months after the seizure of power, Lenin made a change. It must be noted at this point that Lenin was well informed with respect to the experience of the French Revolution. In his early years he had made a study of that upheaval and "during the war years and the proletarian

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

= Mozilla/5.0
ITTP_ACCEPT-

revolution Lenin again returned to the study of the Great Revolution." (The Academy of Sciences of the USSR, *The Memory of Lenin,* 700)

The French dechristianization was fresh in Lenin's mind, but instead of adopting a revolutionary calendar, Lenin, in an official decree, introduced the "New Style" calendar of Pope Gregory XIII.

The move had several highly significant aspects. To begin with, it had been recognized for many years in the bourgeois scientific world that the Gregorian Calendar never represented a scientific means of calculating time. A good review of the defects and errors of the Gregorian calendar is offered by H. W. Bearce ("The Proposed Revision of the Gregorian Calendar," *Scientific Monthly,* July-Dec. 1932). A bourgeois scientist writes: "Experience is daily showing us that the Gregorian calendar no longer meets the exacting requirements of our age." (Elisabeth Achelis, *The World Calendar,* 98). According to a remark in Lenin's Decree, in the formerly Tsarist Academy of Sciences and the Astronomical Society, which now worked for the Bolsheviks, a proposal had been submitted that Lenin adopt not the Gregorian but a scientific calender. *He rejected the proposal!* Here are the reasons he gave for introducing the Gregorian Calendar. Note his reference to the needs of the Church:

"Report on the Decree Introducing the New Calendar in the Russian Republic.

"The benefit which will result from the substitution of the Julian Calendar with the Gregorian, which is accepted in almost the entire world, is so great and varied, from the point of view of international intercourse, and at the same time so obvious that there is no need to prove it. It is sufficient to state that the Gregorian Calendar even under the former regime was accepted in the Navy, in the merchant marine, and was used on different occasions by the former Ministries of Finance, Transport and Internal Affairs, and equally in astronomical and meteorological observations. The question of introducing the New Style in Russia was often raised and was close to a solution as far back as 1830. It can be viewed from four aspects: the Church, astronomical, juridical and economical. For the Church the introduction of the New Style is bound up with the calculation of the dates of the movable holidays, particularly Easter, and with the relations between the Orthodox and the Catholic Churches. With regard to the calculation of holidays the authoritative representatives of the Church long ago pointed out that the adoption of the other calendar does not violate the canons. The basic obstacle had been the apprehension that the introduction of the Gregorian chronology would be interpreted as a concession by the Orthodox denomination to Catholicism. Today, with the changed political circumstances, there can be no talk whatsoever about any kind of encroachment by Catholicism upon the Orthodox denomination. Consequently, this obstacle, too, falls away. It is self-evident that for the democracy of contemporary Russia,

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
ACCEPT-

which stands on the position of separation of Church from State, there can be no talk about the Church side of the question. With the firm intention by the Soviet power not to intervene in the affairs of the self-directing Church, this question is regarded only from the civil point of view, with full freedom accorded the Church to decide the question about one or two styles as the Church will find desirable for itself. Proceeding from these considerations it is pointed out in the following projected decree that it is introduced in civilian relations. From the astronomical point of view the question could be posed, as it was done in the commissions of the Academy of Sciences and the Astronomical Society, of going over not to the Gregorian but to a more perfect one from a purely scientific aspect. However, it is quite obvious that it is essential for Russia to go over to the style which is accepted by the cultured peoples. As to the construction of a more exact calendar from the scientific point of view, this can be left, if the need for this arises, to a future international congress of specialists which will submit a system worked out by it for simultaneous adoption in the entire world."

"Decree on Introduction of West-European Calendar in the Russian Republic. With the view of establishing in Russia the chronological calculation of time used by all cultured nations, the Soviet of People's Commissars resolves to introduce after January of this year a new calendar in civilian relations." *(Izvestia,* #19 (283), Jan. 25, 1918)

With dialectic skill Lenin put aside for a moment his characterization of bourgeois countries as countries of capitalist slavery and called them "cultured nations" with which his "Socialist Republic" had to catch up on the matter of using the Christian chronology. Thus, implicitly, the unscientific Gregorian calendar was foisted on the Russian revolutionary masses as a *progressive* feature. The Decree touched off a new vein of deception of the masses. *Krasnaya Gazeta,* in Zinoviev's domain, made the workers think that a great stride forward was being made: "Up to now we were behind Europe by 13 days." (Feb. 9, 1918)

Rallying to the support of the Decree, Bolshevik writers approved the adoption of the Christian Calendar, ignoring its religious character and its imperfections. Some admitted that the Gregorian Calendar is scientifically incorrect but minimized its faults: "It is often said that the New Style is correct and our old one incorrect. This is obviously not so . . . Is it possible, in this case, to establish a calendar better than the Gregorian? . . . But all this is a fruitless waste of time. The error of the New Style is so small that in reality it has no significance whatsoever . . . if some day a new change in the calendar is made, it will occur probably in an unimaginable distant future." (I. F. Polak, *The Change of the Calendar,* R. 28. Moscow, 1918)

The Lenin regime performed a hocus-pocus with the Biblical myths to make the workers think that the Christian Era adopted by

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lenin was revolutionary. The *Messenger of the Regional Commissariat of Internal Affairs* of the Petrograd and surrounding territory said: "NEW ERA. The earth, the very earth upon which some time back occurred the first historical revolution in Egypt headed by Moses, and the second, which came later, inspired by Christ and his followers—is living through the approach of the third historical revolution carried out by the Russian people, the world, socialist revolution." *(Vestnik Oblastnogo Kommissariata Vnutrennikh Diel,* Soiuza Kommun Severnoi Oblasti, Oct.-Nov. 1918, 49)

6. *Lenin's Adoption of the Christian Chronology Establishes the Christian Aspect of the October Revolution*

A brief comparison between Lenin's policy and the policy of the French leaders of the movement for dechristianization brings out the Christian essence of Lenin's program for the Bolshevik State. In France —"By an unprecendented revolution they established an entirely new era; they changed the divisions of the year, the names of the months and days; they substituted a republican for the Christian calendar." *(The History of Nations, The Fr. Rev.* X, 281-2, ed. Henry Cabot Lodge). But Lenin kept the Bolshevik State within the Christian Era. What were the objectives of the French revolutionists? Several years before the establishment of the Bolshevik State the bourgeois historians of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* wrote: "The objects which the advocates of a new calendar had in view were to strike a blow at the clergy and to divorce all calculations of time from the Christian associations with which they were loaded, in short to abolish the Christian year." ("Fr. Rev." XI, 170)

What objects did Lenin pursue by his policy of perpetuating the Christian Era? Coming upon the stage of history many decades after the first attempt to wipe out Christianity, and standing high above the emotional French revolutionists, Lenin struck a blow at the anti-Christian sentiments of the most advanced Russian workers, soldiers and peasants—in *support* of Christian ideology. The perpetuation of Christianity, which was to be dyed in new political colors, was the essence of Lenin's adopting the Christian Calendar for the Bolshevik State. His policy was the opposite not only of the tempestuous dechristianization of the French Revolution but was also contrary to the meek imitation of that dechristianization by the leaders of the Paris Commune of 1871. The 1871 dechristianization had been initiated by the single act of re-establishing the anti-Christian calendar of the French Revolution. The Stalin historians record: "The Calendar of the French Revolution did not last long—only fourteen years—and in 1806 was abolished by Napoleon and substituted again with the Gregorian calendar. In 1871 in France, after the fall of the Second Empire, the new 'Government of National Defense,' returning to the traditions of the First Revolution, reestablished many Republican undertakings. The French Revolutionary Calendar, too, was reestab-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

lished, but again not for long. The Paris Commune existed only 72 days, from March 18 to May 28, 1871. After that the Gregorian Calendar is again dominant in France." (V. A. Rossovskaya, *The Calendar Distance of the Ages,* R. 66). On the question of maintaining the Christian Era Lenin followed in the footsteps not of the French Revolution and of the Paris Commune but of Bonaparte and Thiers.

Trotsky in his autobiography says regarding the legislative tasks of the early period of the Bolshevik State: "Everything had to proceed from the beginning. There were no 'precedents,' since history had none to offer." History had offered many precedents which the Bolshevik leaders ignored—among them precedents with respect to the calendar: on the one hand the discarding of the Dionysian-Julian Calendar by the Protestant States of Germany (1699) and by England (1752) and the adoption of Pope Gregory's Calendar by these countries; and, on the other, the introduction of the anti-Christian Calendar by the French Revolution and the use of this Calendar by the Paris Commune in 1871. And Lenin actually *did* follow a precedent in history—the example of the Protestant German States and of England.

Viewed from another angle, a policy of dechristianization in Lenin's epoch would have met infinitely more favorable circumstances than in the epoch of the French Revolution. When Cloots, Gobel and their followers succeeded in having the Convention adopt the anti-Christian Calendar, France was surrounded by a deeply benighted Feudal Europe. In Lenin's epoch, however, the masses of Europe were relatively literate, there existed an enormous proletariat subjectively anti-capitalist and to some degree anti-religious. In Russia itself, due to the modern means of communication, transportation and other economic developments, and especially because of the Imperialist War, the peasantry stood on a far higher political level than the French peasantry in 1793. Interestingly enough, during the introduction of the anti-Christian calendar in 1793—"The peasant mass, illiterate and ignorant in almost the entire country, allowed full freedom of action to the dechristianizers with an indifference that almost permits the conclusion that perhaps this mass was never deeply Christianized." (Aulard, 6). And in a very brief time the anti-Christian calendar was so fully accepted by the French masses that when Napoleon was discarding one vestige of the Revolution after another, "the last to go was the Republican calendar." *(Enc. Br.* XIX, 201). In 1918 the masses of the world were so far advanced over the French of 1793 that there can be no doubt that had Lenin adopted an anti-Christian calendar he would have received enthusiastic support not only in Russia but also abroad.

If, as the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* states, "The point of departure of the Convention's policy of dechristianization was the Republican Calendar." (XXI, 716), then Lenin's adoption of the Christian

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Calendar was the point of departure of his deliberate policy of building Marxist Neo-Christianity in the Bolshevik State.

Since Lenin's policy was to Neo-Christianize the masses, he sought to enlist the support of the Tsarist Greek Orthodox "specialists" and in his Decree advanced arguments calculated to prevent an opposition to the adoption of the New Style. In the beginning the old clergy led by Patriarch Tikhon rejected Lenin's Decree. However—"When in 1923 the Constantinople Conclave composed of eight patriarchs took the decision to adopt the New Style, Patriarch Tikhon in a letter addressed to Seraphim of Finland, dated July 10, 1923 said: 'I bless the adoption of the New Style.'" (I. N. Cherniavin, *Old and New Style,* R.)

The Bolshevik historians and academicians have written many articles and books dealing with the question of the calendar. Revealingly enough, they never call Lenin's Decree "revolutionary" or even "progressive." On the other hand, the anti-Gregorian calendar of the French Revolution always received a word of recognition of its revolutionary character. "An attempt to free the calendar from religious influences and survivals of the pre-scientific period in astronomical knowledge was made in the Republican Calendar which was introduced in France by the Convention with the Decree of October 5, 1793. The calendar had a vividly expressed revolutionary and anti-religious character." (V. K. Nikolsky, *The Origin of Our Chronology,* R. 30, State Publishing, 1938). "It was a true revolutionary calendar." (V. A. Rossovskaya, *The Change of the Calendar,* 62). "The Era of the birth of Christ was also discarded. The starting point of the new chronology was the day of the proclamation of the Republic." (64). Indirectly and by unguarded implication the Bolsheviks show their consciousness of the religious nature of the calendar introduced by Lenin. The introduction to Rossovskaya's *Calendar Distance of the Ages* speaks of—"the *only* effort in history (our emphasis—G. S.) to liberate the calendar from religious influences, namely: the Republican Calendar and chronology of the French bourgeois-democratic revolution at the end of the Eighteenth Century . . . the Republican Era, the most sensible of all eras that figure in historical chronology . . ."

If any Frenchman had asked the meaning of the "Year III" inscribed on the money of the Convention, the obvious reply would have been: This means, the third year of the establishment of the Republic. In Turkey or Egypt one would have received the reply: We count our Moslem Era from the year of the Hegira—Mahomet's flight from Mecca. But in Lenin's "Socialist Republic" an inquiry as to the meaning of the figures "1918," "1919" or "1920" on the money issued by Lenin could evoke either some brazen Bolshevik evasion or the following admission: In our Socialist Soviet Workers and Peasants Russia led by Comrade Lenin, who during the Great October Revolution established the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, we count the time, in accordance with his Decree, from the year Jesus Christ was born,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

and the figure "1918" or "1919" means simply that this money has been issued in the year 1918, or 1919, or 1920 of our Lord Jesus Christ. The Bolshevik burocrats openly admitted that the starting point in their chronology was not their own Revolution, not some revolutionary event in history, but the fictitious date of the birth of the mythical Christian Messiah. But they have been offering excuses for the continuous use of this unscientific, unhistorical, religious date. Thus, twenty years after Lenin's Decree, V. K. Nikolsky wrote: "Why then do we up to this very day conduct the computation of years from the birth of Christ, or, to be correct, from the day to which the Church, without any real basis, ascribes the birth of the mythical Christ? Exclusively out of practical considerations." (55)

With such phrases as "practical considerations" the Stalin burocrats have veiled the grim fact that ideologically Lenin chained the Russian revolutionary masses to Christianity, that his Decree ordering the adoption of the Christian Calendar was a cornerstone in the construction of a Marxist Christian Church, for the Christian Calendar, Dionysian-Julian or Gregorian, is an inseparable part of Christianity.

From the day of Lenin's official Decree of Christianization of the Bolshevik State all his talk about separation of State and Church became sheer hypocrisy.

7. *The Celebration of Christmas—A Marxist Tradition*

In Christian countries the Christian Calendar is generally a part of the social unconsciousness of the population. Barring a few individuals here and there, the Calendar in "normal" times is accepted unthinkingly, without any pause for analysis of its social-political implications. It is a routine matter as breathing. However in times when the masses are awakened by world-shaking events, the every-day social apathy gives place to a sudden rise of social consciousness which questions every facet of life under old conditions. Although much remains obscure, some things become glaringly obvious. And one of these things is the fact that the day of the greatest and gayest festivities in the Christian world, the celebration of the birth of the supposed founder of Christianity, is a date arbitrarily chosen by the Church, that the whole Christian Calendar is an artificial concoction filled with myths. Regarding Christmas—"before the 5th Century there was no general concensus of opinion as to when it should come in the calendar, whether on the 6th of January or the 25th of March, or the 25th of December." *(Enc. Br. "Christmas,"* VI, 293). Two references to December 25 occurring in Ancient writings are made, but one of them is "probably spurious" while the other "is almost certainly interpolated." *(Ib.)*

During the French Revolution the dechristianizers devised effective means to obliterate the dates of Christian holidays, particularly Christmas, from the mind of the population by changing the date

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the beginning of the year. The January 1 start of the year had been a pagan holiday, later made a Christian holiday. "The date at which the year commenced varied at different periods and in different countries. When Julius Caesar reformed the calendar (45 B.C.) he fixed 1 January as New Year's Day . . . Pope Gregory XIII . . . determined that the year should begin with 1 January." *(Cath. Enc.* III, 739). The Christian year begins as—"A festival commemorating the circumcision of Jesus, held on the first of January in the Roman Catholic, Eastern, and Anglican Churches." *(Webster's,* 489)

January 1 definitely became the holiday of all Christendom. Astronomically the day as a starting point of the year has no sense whatsoever. On the other hand, the French Revolutionary Calendar's year began at a logical astronomical point, the Autumn equinox.

The abolition of January 1 as New Year's Day was enforced by the Convention which, as in some other matters, pursued a correct aim through wrong methods: "it was strictly forbidden to celebrate it as New Year's, and on that day even letters were opened in the Post Office to determine whether there were any New Year's greetings. Letters containing such greetings were immediately destroyed." (Rossovskaya, *The Change of the Calendar,* R. 64)

Marx and Engels studied the French Revolution but followed in the footsteps of Pope Gregory XIII. Celebration of Christmas, as well as January 1 as New Year's, was part of their lives. They hardly ever failed to exchange Christian holiday greetings. Celebrating together with other Christians, Marx and Engels observed the custom of giving presents on the day the Church commemorated the birth of the mythical Christ: "Dear Fred! Excuse me that I only today thank you in the name of the whole family for the Christmas present . . . I wish you happiness for the New Year! The same to Mrs. Lizzy." (Marx to Engels, Dec. 26, 1865, XXIII, 315, 316)

The two founders of Marxism did not confine their Christmas greetings to mutual exchanges but sent them to others. Writing to his brother Herman, a week before Christmas, Engels said: "Hearty greetings to mother, your wife and all brothers and sisters. I wish you happy holidays." (Dec. 18, 1868, 548)

After Marx's death Engels regularly exchanged Christian greetings with various leading figures of the Second International.

Lenin was a true follower of Marx and Engels and therefore was sentimentally Christian like them: "I wish you happy holidays." (Lenin to mother, Dec. 13, 1902, Old Style, *Letters to Relatives,* R. 288)

In the matter of celebrating Christmas, Lenin, since he was *Russian* to the marrow of his bones, and since the Julian calendar then used in Russia was 13 days behind the Gregorian, gave preference to the Julian holidays, but he celebrated the Gregorian too. On December 21, 1912 Old Style, he wrote "I congratulate all of you with the holidays! I wish you a very happy holiday time . . . We intend to

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

celebrate the Russian holidays to a greater degree than the local ones." (384)

Lenin's sentimental attachment to the "commemoration of the birth of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" continued after he established the Bolshevik State to the very last Christmas of his life. In December 1923, two months before his end, "On Christmas a Christmas tree was set up for children, participated in by Vladimir Ilyich." *(Umer Lenin,* Moscow, 1924, 47)

Emotionally and politically Lenin was a Christian, and this was registered in more than one way. When he died the Bolshevik Church, naturally through an understanding with the Stalin Trio, called Lenin a "Christian soul." Stalin's Chairman of the Holy Synod sent to Stalin's stooge "president" of the USSR a message:

"Response to the death of V. I. Lenin. To the Central Committee of the USSR. Chairman M. I. Kalinin. The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church expresses its sincere sorrow at the death of the great liberator of our people . . ." Then, addressing the deceased—"Eternal memory and everlasting peace to your long-enduring, benevolent and Christian soul. Chairman of the Holy Synod, Metropolitan Evdokim." *(Christianin,* June 1924, 6)

Christianin was printed by the Bolshevik State in the same office which put out the Bolshevik paper, *Krasny Luch,* in a town near Moscow, as marked: "Printshop and bindery of the editorial staff of *Krasny Luch* of the city of Zvenigorod." (64)

The Leninist burocrats promoted the Christmas ideology as early as the Smolny period towards the end of 1917. The Bolshevik "Commission on Public Education of the Central City Duma" plastered a proclamation on the walls of Petrograd, instructing the workers: " 'Arrange with your own resources Christmas trees and entertainment for the children.' " (Cited in *Through the Russian Revolution* by Albert Rhys Williams, 305)

The Comintern burocracy, in line with the Marx-Engels-Lenin tradition, has been observing Christmas by draping this Christian holiday in a Left cloak: "For many people Christmas has lost its religious association; it is no longer exclusively the holiday of those who affirm belief in Christianity. In long years of changing custom, it has come out of its sectarian halo; it has become a humanitarian symbol: an expression of good cheer and good will, of warm, brotherly interest.

"We of the working class who are seeking a closer bond in comradeship with our fellow-men welcome the spirit of Christmas." *(Daily Worker,* Nov. 17, 1936). The Cannon-Shachtman leaders always found ways and means of creating an impression they were to the Left of their Stalin cousins. At the time Cannon-Shachtman officially called their movement "a faction of the Comintern" they gave a "revolutionary" flavor to this traditional Church holiday: "Red Christmas enter-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tainment in New York for benefit of the Militant." *(Militant,* Dec. 19, 1931)

Having placed the Bolshevik State firmly upon the Christian line, the Bolshevik burocracy has been observing Christmas and the Gregorian New Year's Day with ever greater lavishness, enthusiasm and consumption of alcoholic beverages. In the Marxist movement the Bolshevik burocrats were not the originators of celebrating Christmas and New Year's with drunken orgies. That was initiated by Marx's collaborator, Engels. During Christmas Engels drank himself almost into insensibility: "Dear Marx! The numerous Christmas drinking-bouts and the resultant general unfitness for business made me completely incapable of answering you earlier." (Jan. 3, 1864. XXIII, 172)

That with the co-founder of Marxism this particular occasion of excessive intoxication in memory of the "birth of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ" and the "Circumcision" was not accidental but represented a definite pattern is seen from the warning sent to him by Marx six years earlier. Marx, evidently, knew that from Christmas to New Year's Engels usually drank to a point where he might injure his health. Marx wrote him on Christmas day, 1857: "I hope that during . . . the holidays you refrain from too much drinking and take care of your health." (XXIII, 278)

The Bolshevik burocrats, pretending to safeguard the masses against excessive drinking on Christian holidays, wrote:

"Every religious holiday was used by the ruling classes and the Church to intensify the stupefaction of the toilers . . . Drunkenness and debauch, often accompanied with fights and murder, invariably went together with the Church holidays, and this even more strengthened their most damaging decomposing action." *(Nastolny Kalendar Uchitelia na 1941,* 333)

But a worker, reading the Marx-Engels Correspondence published by these very burocrats, could find a Marxist set of examples of falling completely under the influence of alcohol during the annual festival of the Christmas season, the period when the entire Christendom was stirred by the Church mythology about the life and Crucifixion of "the Savior." The practice was adhered to by no less a Marxist authority than Engels.

In one of the extremely rare moments of slips of his pen, Engels, a day or two after he half-sobered up from his Christmas celebration, made this astounding statement:

"Christmas is the only period in the year when I feel, apart from the office, that I stand with one foot in the camp of the bourgeoisie." (Engels to Mrs. Marx, Jan. 3, 1868. *Wks.* XXIV, R. I)

To translate Engels' statement into scientific terms, he felt that emotionally he was fully attached to Christianity, sharing this attachment with the bourgeoisie, and that he was aware of this emotional unity with Christianity most strongly in the period known as the feast of the Nativity of Jesus Christ.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

8. *Lenin Disrupts the Healthy Development Within the Left-Moving Clergy*

The official adoption of the Christian Calendar by the Lenin regime generated an infinitely greater force for perpetuating Christianity as a whole than any material aid he might have offered to the clergy. The imperialist war had shaken the prestige of the Church the world over, particularly in Russia, Germany and France. In every grave social crisis during the first stages of collapse of the old order, classes, groups and even family units undergo a process of political differentiation. This is true also of the clergy. A section of the clergy makes an earnest shift to the Left in an endeavor to establish justice and happiness for the oppressed masses—a move which leads in the direction of final disentanglement of the Left clergy and the masses from superstitious beliefs and the power of the oppressing minorities whom the Church serves. In the French Revolution many priests, such as Roux and less known, broke with the Feudal aristocracy, and even with the bourgeoisie. Lenin's policy of making Bolshevik Russia a Christian State diverted the Left clergy in Russia and abroad from the normal healthy course of breaking completely with the Church, of discarding the robes and adopting professions useful in building a cooperative workers commonwealth. Lenin enlisted them as specialists in poisoning the mind of the masses. The American Bishop Brown, the Dean of Canterbury, Johnson, and many others like them might have taken the true path. But, as Lenin ruined the subjectively honest bourgeois specialists with his policy of bribery and corruption, so did he ruin the sincere Left-moving clergy with his Neo-Christianization policy. He left open only two ultimate alternatives to the Marxist-infected international Left clergy—uncritical support to the Bolshevik Christian State or "critical" support to the bourgeois Christian State.

9. *Lenin Suppresses Attempts at Dechristianization; Bolshevik Policy of Spurious Atheism*

Even at its highest point the revolutionary awareness of the Russian masses on the question of religion and Christianity was on a lower level than that of the French masses in 1793. This comparative lack of awareness was in line with the deceptive Marxist thesis "Religion is a private affair"—a thesis stemming from the fact that Marxism itself has always pursued a Christian policy which, naturally, excluded a scientific education of the vanguard masses on the question of Christianity.

During and for a time after the Bolshevik Revolution, however, many workers and peasants instinctively moved far ahead of the Marxist leadership. Many individuals dropped their Christian names, substituting names ideologically connected with revolutionary events, immediate or past. Infants were named "Octobrin," "Octobrina,"

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Revolutsia." The Christian Calendar was discarded in some places and the Christian holidays erased. The symbol of Crucifixion was being removed. "As reported by *Pravda,* upon the decision of the local Soviet, in the Mozhgin Valost, Malmizh u. Viatskoy Gub. the old church has been transformed into people's theatre. The cross was removed from the belfry of the church and replaced with the red flag." *(Revolutsia i Tserkov,* #2, 1919, 34)

These were crude, unscientific methods. But Lenin stifled even these initial, locally-instituted attempts to grope towards a higher consciousness which eventually could lead to the relegation of Christianity to the museum. Bourgeois correspondents abroad, in doing their research on the problems of the calendar, took note of Lenin's reaction: "local authorities began to emulate the French Revolution and to show their revolutionary zeal by altering the names of the months and days, substituting the names of Pugacheff and Stenka Razin for Easter and Christmas, and making other changes in the spirit of the age. But when the Central Government obtained real control, all these local innovations were cancelled. During the period of the New Economic Policy (1921-28) there was little interference with the calendar . . . Official almanacs of that period show a curious mixture of revolution and religion." *(Journal of Calendar Reform,* VI, #2, Aug. 1936, 70)

Lenin's Neo-Christian policy was exercised in various ways ranging from the open Decree of implicit designation of the Bolshevik State as Christian to the issuing of official Marxist-Christian almanacs. One of the methods was to have auxiliary agencies of the State adopt various measures. For example—"The Moscow Soviet of Trade Unions decided to consider as holidays the following ten days in addition to Sundays and revolutionary holidays: Christmas, 2 days; Easter, 2 days; Whit Monday; Annunciation; Transfiguration; Ascension; Assumption; Epiphany." *(Nastolny Sovietsky Kalendar,* 7. Published in 1920 by Novy Internatsional, N. Y.)

In 1918 the Lenin regime established Christmas-New Year's and Easter vacations for schools—teachers and pupils—from the 23 of December to 7 of January and from 1 to 14 of April. ("Proletarian Holidays," *Soviet Calendar for 1919,* R. 4. Published by the All-Russ. Cent. Ex. Com. Moscow)

Lenin's adoption of Christian chronology gave an official backing to the marking of all State, Bolshevik Party and private documents with the implicit legend: In the year of our Lord Jesus Christ. The "anti-religious" spectacles and parades of the Bezbozhniks ridiculing religion (The Godless Ones) were in fact a clever masquerade to divert attention from Lenin's Neo-Christian policy. The literature of the Bezbozhniks contained pseudo-scientific attacks on religion. There is noted a complete lack of systematic exposure of Christianity as an anti-Semitic religion—unquestionably a deliberate policy. Judaism is not exposed but is attacked in the approved Marxist anti-Semitic

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

style, with illustrations picturing rabbis with "Jewish" noses. That the Bolsheviks are *Christian* "atheists" can be further seen from the type of the translation and popularization of imported Left Christian bourgeois "atheistic" literature. For example, Upton Sinclair in 1918 published a work *The Profits of Religion* containing Left-Christianism which reads as follows:

"This book will be denounced from one end of Christendom to the other as the work of a blasphemous infidel. Yet it stands in the direct line of the Christian tradition . . . The way to get the spirit of the tirades of Jesus is to do with him what we did with the early church fathers—translate him into American. This time, since the reader shares the secret, it will not be necessary to disguise the Bible style, and we may follow the text exactly. Let me try the twenty-third chapter of Matthew, omitting several verses which refer to subtleties of Hebrew casuistry . . ." (290). The work contains the following Left-Christian-Marxist-Judaist-Anarchist-Liberal hash: "The spirit of equality and brotherhood which spoke through Ezekiel and Amos and Isaiah, through John the Baptist and Jesus and James, spoke in the last century through Marx and Lassalle and Jaures, and speaks today through Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht and Israel Zangwill and Morris Hillquit and Abraham Cahan and Emma Goldman and the Joseph Fels movement." (285)

The Bolshevik burocrats "analyzed" this work of Sinclair's as anti-religious: "At the same time Sinclair wrote a series of journalistic works, pamphlets against religion *(Profits of Religion,* 1918)." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LI, 171). Having translated this Left Christian work, the Bolshevik burocrats fed it to the Russian masses.

Marxist Christian "atheism" was early utilized by the Bolshevik burocracy. Thus, in 1918 the Petrograd Soviet of Workers and Red Army Soldiers issued a translation of Lafargue's supposedly atheistic work *Origin of Religious Beliefs.* The work distorted the character of Christianity and, drawing upon the Church text, gave historicity to the mythical Christian Messiah: "If Christianity in the first centuries after its origin was a religion of the poor among whom the State and the rich daily distributed food, then today it has become the religion of the bourgeoisie among whom is being distributed daily the wealth created by the hands of the poor. Christ said: 'Look at the birds in the sky, they do not sow, and do not reap, and your heavenly Father is feeding them . . . Your heavenly Father knows that you require everything.' But the bourgeoisie cannot admit that it is a parasite . . ." (11-12)

There is Lenin's own contribution to the masked Bolshevik campaign to implant belief in the historicity of Jesus Christ. In 1920 he published the second edition of his book *Materialism and Empiriocriticism.* In it Lenin presented as if grounded on fact the *New Testament* story about "Judas" betraying the mythical founder of Christianity to the Jews: "The philosophy of the naturalist Mach stands in

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

relation to natural science as the kiss of the Christian Judas stood in relation to Christ. Mach similarly betrays . . ." (R. 355)

The following citation from a "Soviet" calendar clearly shows that the Bolsheviks, calling themselves *atheists,* in actuality pursue a Christian "atheist" policy: "Out of practical considerations the atheists too thus far have to conduct the chronology in accord with this Era which has come down to us from the past. In order to demarcate ourselves from the Churchmen we call it simply 'our era' or 'our chronology.' That's why instead of writing 'The year 1941 from the birth of Christ' or 'the 753rd year before the birth of Christ,' we write: year 1941 of our chronology or our era; the 753rd year prior to the chronology of our era. There is no doubt whatsoever that when, in the near future, the entire present calendar and the whole international chronology will be subjected to a cleansing from Church influences, then the mythical era of counting from 'the birth of Christ' will be put into the museum." *(Nastolny Kalendar Uchitelia na 1941,* 22)

The bourgeoisie, both before it secured political power and after, was avowedly religious. The United States beginning in 1866 has been placing on its coins the motto: "In God we trust." But the Bolsheviks, having always pretended that their ideology was atheist, could not but continue this pretense after they seized power in order to conceal the Christian character of their State with a deceptive "anti-religious" cloak. Using this cloak Lenin wiped out whatever incipient genuine atheism there appeared in the Bolshevik State. In France after the abolition of the use of the Revolutionary Calendar by Napoleon, and later after the fall of the Commune, by Thiers, the atheistic elements had no choice but the use of the Gregorian Calendar. Lenin left no alternative to the atheistic elements in Russia and abroad except the use of the Christian chronology.

10. *The Ingenious Combining of the Marxist and the Christian Holidays*

Sunday, of course, is a Christian holiday. It was introduced by Emperor Constantine to be observed by the Roman slave society in 321 of the Christian Era. Since that period Sunday has been "celebrated in memory of the resurrection of Christ, as the principal day for public worship." *(Enc. Br.* "Sunday," XXVI, 94). The Bolsheviks before their seizure of power never read any other meaning into the observance of Sunday. Marx recognized it as a Christian holiday. In a letter to Kugelmann, dated March 26, 1870, Marx wrote: "But tomorrow is Sunday and therefore a good Christian like myself is allowed to interrupt his work and to write to you a long letter." After the Bolsheviks stabilized their power they made this traditional Christian holiday a "day of rest," cloaking its religious essence with phrases about the supposed separation of their State from their Left Church:

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

"Sunday, weekly holiday of the Christians . . . The early Christians for a long time observed also Saturday until the final myth about Jesus resurrecting on the third day after his death on the cross . . . In the Soviet Union, with the separation of the Church from the State, Sunday became exclusively a day of rest . . ." *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* XIII, "Sunday," 199-200)

How the Marxist-Christian Calendar and the Red Cross were tied together by the Bolsheviks is seen from the example furnished by the "Soviet" *General Calendar of the Russian Association of the Red Cross, 1924.* The *Calendar* was edited by the Bolshevik Commissar of Health, Z. P. Soloviev, and published by the Bolshevik *Krasnaya Nov* in Moscow. Apart from the fact that on the cover there is a large cross, there are the Marxist and Christian holidays for each month. Thus, January: "1, New Year's. 6, Epiphany." (5). March: "18, Day of the Paris Commune. 25, Annunciation." (9). May: "1, The Day of the International; 29, Ascension of Christ." (13). June: "8-9, Trinity." (15). November: "7, Day of the Proletarian Revolution." (25). December: "25 and 26, Christmas." (27)

As we observe, the Bolsheviks introduced a clever trick of combining Marxist and Christian calendar contents. Here is a sample from a calendar Stalin printed specially for the peasantry: "Non-work days for 1928: January 1, New Year's; 22, the massacre of workers in Petersburg in 1905 (January 9 old style) and the commemoration of death of V. I. Lenin occurring on the preceding evening. March 12, the overthrow of the autocracy; March 18, the Day of the Paris Commune. May 1, the Day of the International. November 7th, Day of Proletarian Revolution. In addition, the following are designated as days of rest: March 25, Annunciation. April 14-16, Easter. May 24, Ascension of Christ. June 3, Trinity. June 4, Whit-Monday. August 6, Transfiguration. August 15, Assumption of the Holy Virgin. December 25 and 26, Christmas." *(Krestiansky Kalendar na 1928,* 2)

The Orthodox Church Calendar for 1947 was "Printed in the 13th Printshop of the 'Poligrokniga' of the OGIZ of the Soviet Ministers of the USSR" (2). The mixture of the Church and Marxist holidays in it reads: "The Commemoration Day of V. I. Lenin and 9 of January 1905" (7). "Day of the Red Army" (10). "International Woman's Day (11). "Good Friday." "Resurrection of Christ. Easter Sunday." (12). "The Exaltation of the Cross" (25). "The Thirtieth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution." (28). "The Birth of the Lord God and our Savior Jesus Christ" (32)

11. *The Hidden Feature in the Christian Calendar*

In adopting the Gregorian Calendar Lenin was in all probability not conscious of one specific aspect of his policy. The fact is that neither the Left idealists in the French Revolution, nor the Marxist and Liberal scholars ever realized that the Christian Calendar is *an anti-*

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Semitic calendar. This feature is not an obvious one but the *full* legend of this Calendar, burned into the psychology of Christianity, is: In the year of Our Lord Jesus Christ, crucified by the Jews. To be sure, in polite Christian circles the discreet Liberals would hardly venture to utter the full formula, but the pogrom agitators used it freely on more than one occasion. In a country of a non-Christian calendar the population takes no note of any particular date that coincides with Good Friday, the day when, according to the Christian fiction, the Jews murdered the founder of Christianity. But in a State which adopts the Christian calendar the population is keenly aware of the Christian holy days, particularly the days commemorating the birth of the mythical Christ, his Crucifixion and Resurrection.

In France at the height of dechristianization the Christian holiday dates began to fade from mass memory, but with the return of the Gregorian Calendar they were vividly brought back to mind.

The population of a non-Christian, non-Mohammedan State might or might not be infected with anti-Semitism, but in a State in which life is adjusted by the Christian Calendar the mass psychology is anti-Jewish because at the root of the Christian psychology pervading this Calendar is the story of Crucifixion. And whether one is only vaguely aware of this fact, or not at all, one cannot escape its action, because the Calendar and the life of every individual are closely connected. "Of the many ways of reckoning time, the Christian calendar is the most widespread; it is of interest to all, for like a wrist-watch it is frequently consulted in the regulation of our lives." (Archer, *The Christian Calendar and the Gregorian Reform*, "Preface")

No scientific dechristianization is possible without the exposure of the anti-Semitic essence of Christianity, and therefore of the Christian Calendar. The rejection of the Christian Calendar by the French Revolution was only in part scientific because the dechristianizers dealt only with the Church deceptions and religious superstitions but left out the side which brands a group of people as the murderer of the founder of Christianity. Had they included this aspect in their dechristianization program they would not only have cleansed France of Christian Defamation of the Jewish Scapegoat but would have dealt a terrific blow to the Defamation as a whole and on a world scale. As it was, France remained anti-Semitic despite the bitter condemnation of the Christian Calendar.

Lenin's Decree introducing the Gregorian Calendar so that Russia would be in unison with "all cultured nations" opened a wide legal avenue to Christian Defamation in all fields. Scientific dechristianization would have staged the *Merchant of Venice* for purpose of enlightenment on the subject of anti-Semitism, not for the poisoning of the masses with anti-Semitism, as was done by the Lenin regime. Condemnation would have been the policy with respect to the "revolutionary" poetry which wept about Jesus crucified by rich Jews—a Left paraphrase of "The Jews Killed Our Lord"—or which portrayed

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Jesus "in a wreath of roses" leading the Red Guards. The French dechristianizers would have branded poets like Bedny, Blok and other Left Christian "Soviet" penmen as agents of the Church; Lenin picked up a host of Bednys, who had been afloat in the Tsarist days, and enlisted them as aids in carrying out his Left Christian anti-Semitic policy.

In Russia there was a large non-Christian section of the population—Mohammedans, Jews, Buddhists and others. By officially adopting the Christian Calendar and thus stamping his State as a part of Christendom, Lenin factually followed Church tradition of implicitly giving an alien status to non-Christians in a Christian State. However, of all the non-Christian segments in the population of the Bolshevik State, only the Jews were doubly branded psychologically by Lenin's adoption of the Christian Calendar. Since the Christian Calendar contains no attacks upon Mohammedans and Buddhists, but is permeated with anti-Semitic allusions and insinuations, Lenin's act branded the "Soviet" Jews not only as aliens but above all as descendants of the murderers of the Christian Savior upon whose supposed birth, life, death and resurrection the Calendar adopted by Lenin is based.

12. *The Bolshevik Christian Calendar a Means of Anti-Semitic Inculcation of the Masses*

By means of the Calendar the Bolshevik State has been glorifying many reactionary figures of Tsarist times, such as the butcher of the Christian and the Jewish masses in the Ukraine, Bogdan Khmelnitsky. By the same means the Bolshevik State has advertised Left Christian "Crucifixion" anti-Semites like Tolstoy and outright anti-Semitic ideological poisoners like Dostoevsky, using for this purpose "Soviet" writers of the authoritative type. Thus, in the *Nastolny Kalendar* of 1946, commemorating the sixty sixth anniversary of the death of Dostoevsky, on the page opposite the date of 9 February, the Stalin burocracy has presented to the masses the following "Tolstoy-Dostoevsky" sales talk by Maxim Gorky: "Tolstoy and Dostoevsky—two greatest geniuses. By the might of their talents they shook the whole world. They turned the amazed attention of entire Europe upon Russia."

Through the vehicle of the Calendar the Stalin regime has popularized the foremost anti-Semitic dramatist, the author of "Shylock," and has invested him with "Soviet" citizenship: "The basic power of Shakespeare as an artist consists in that the characters in his works are not marionettes behind which is felt the guiding hand of the author, not the speaking trumpets of his ideas, but living people, 'typical characters,' shown in 'typical circumstances' ('Marx and Engels on Art,' p. 163) . . . And the remarkable fact is no accident that precisely with us in the Soviet Union Shakespeare found his new fatherland." *(Nastolny Kalendar Uchitelia na 1941,* 128, 131)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

The old-fashioned, common, *Church* variety of the Crucifixion theme the Stalin burocrats transmit to the masses through the calendars printed for the distribution by their Marxist Left Church. The printing of Church literature in general has been facilitated—"the Church has received explicit permission to order any quantity of testaments, prayer books and liturgical service books . . ." (Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury, *Soviet Success,* 120). Stalin's Patriarch Alexei has made this statement: "The Church is very happy that the Soviet State heeds all its needs." ("The Patriarch Talks of Church and State," *Soviet Russia Today,* Nov. 1945, 13). "We consider that Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin has created the best possible condition for the work of the Church. We receive great support from him in all our needs and desires. Repeatedly Joseph Vissarionovich has asked us to tell him if there is anything we want or need and he would see to it that they are satisfied." *(Ib.)*

Stalin's "permission" to the Church to order any amount of literature is backed with State supply of paper and print shops, as admitted by the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia:* "Religious centers may publish spiritual journals and other books of religious content, for which purpose the State places at their disposal printing establishments and supplies them with paper." (Supplement "U.S.S.R.," 1787). We see again that the Bolshevik "separation of Church from State" is as much a Marxist fraud as all the other Marxist "revolutionary" measures. The "needs of the Church" are, naturally, the needs of the Bolshevik burocracy whom this Church serves, and one of the burocracy's needs is to saturate the mind of the masses with the Crucifixion theme.

A point of difference must be noted between the Church and the Bolsheviks in this matter. The Church has only one story to tell about the Crucifixion, that in Ancient Judea there appeared a divine person, a Messiah whom the Jews rejected and caused to perish in agony nailed to a cross. The dignitaries of the Church never pretended to offer systematic, scientific proof of their story. The Bolsheviks, on the other hand, amassed in their scholarly works a formidable amount of logical argument and a staggering number of facts which show that the Crucifixion story is fictitious. Here is a sample of the Bolshevik investigation:

"The non-historicity of Jesus Christ is proved first of all by the complete silence about him by the entire extra-Christian, Jewish and Greek-Roman literature of the first centuries of Christianity . . . Complete nonsense and contradiction are the Evangelic tales about the trial and execution of Jesus Christ . . . The Evangelic Pilate represents an utter opposite of the historical Pilate, a bloodthirsty and haughty despot, vicious anti-Semite, who more than once butchered the Jews. Also false is the Evangelical description of the execution of Jesus Christ. The Romans . . . were tying the victims to the posts with ropes or chains; they did not fasten them with nails. The executions

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

were performed by special hangmen selected from among the slaves, not by warriors. No Golgotha of any kind ever existed in Jerusalem." *(Gr. Sov. Enc. "Jesus Christ,"* XXVII, 724, 5, 6)

We see, thus, that if the Church can be accused of pretending to believe that the Jews murdered "Our Divine Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," the Bolsheviks cannot be accused of such pretense. They have always *known* that the story is an invention of the Church which had existed long before a single word about the Crucifixion was written, long before the Church adopted the cross as its symbol. The Bolsheviks *know* that this Church story is a monstrous frame-up of a group of people called *the Jews.* Moreover, since the whole "Soviet" Christian population as well as the Jews and probably all other non-Christian groups are familiar with the accusation against the Jews, the Bolshevik burocrats must pretend to denounce the Tsarist Church for spreading it: "The Church, assisting the exploiters in everything, aided them in the task of inflaming hatred against the Jews. The Church was spreading among the masses the fairy tale that the Jews must be hated because they supposedly killed the Christian god Jesus Christ." (Sheinman, *About Rabbis and Synagogues,* R.)

Thus the Bolshevik burocrats indicate their recognition of the fact that the story of the Crucifixion is used for attacking the Jews. In light of this consciousness of the Bolshevik burocrats, how much more arrogantly criminal they are than the Tsarist and all other Churches, how vastly more vicious than a fanatical mob of illiterate Crusaders who butchered the Jews "to avenge the sufferings of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," when, guided by Lenin's policy, they use their own Church in the ideological hounding of the Jews with the two-thousand-year old Crucifixion frameup! The seemingly profound Bolshevik scholarly "anti-Christian" reference books like the *Great Soviet Encylopedia* are not popularized among the wide masses, but the superstition-laden calendars of all sorts reach into the very thick of the "Soviet" population. And while most of the civilian Bolshevik-Christian calendars only in a general way fortify the Ancient frameup of the Jews, the Church-Bolshevik calendars, printed in State shops on paper supplied by the State, do so with special stress. They remind the Russian masses: "Good Friday. The commemoration of the Savior's sufferings and death on the cross." *(Pravoslavny Tserkovny Kalendar,* 1945, 44). And for greater effect the editors of the Bolshevik Church calendars change the form of address. They tend to intensify the power of the Crucifixion story, and therefore the aversion of the Christian masses toward the Jews "Christ-killers," by addressing the "victim" of the Jews himself: "You, most patient, were bespit, beaten, slapped and crucified for the salvation of the world, Christ, our true God." *(Pr. Ts. Kal.* 1947, 66)

The above citation might be regarded as accusing the Jews by implication only. However, once Lenin introduced the policy of Christianization of the State and of inculcating the masses with Chris-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tian anti-Semitism, this policy, logically, had to reach the very depth of this form of anti-Semitism, the manufacture by the Bolshevik State of popular Passion poison by *explicitly* identifying the *Jews* as the tormentors and murderers of the Christian man-god. Thus far we have shown that the Bolshevik burocracy made use of the Passion story by Tolstoy and the Passion theme poetry by the "Soviet" writers. Through its Church literature the Bolshevik burocracy spread among the masses stories containing the minutest details of the torture of Christ by the Jews and their cruel attitude toward the man-god's mother. We must bear in mind that the Bolsheviks are *conscious* of the fact that the only truth in the Passion theme is that it inflames to the highest degree the passion of hatred against the living Jewish Scapegoat. And one more observation: the Christian-Capitalist State, due to the bourgeois form of economy, creates the impression that it stands aloof from the production and dissemination of Passion incitement against the Jewish Scapegoat. But in a Christian-proletarian State where the machinery of manufacture and distribution of literature is in the hands of this State, it is impossible to conceal who the real culprit is. Quite often the identification appears in microscopic type in an obscure spot on the back cover of a Bolshevik Christian anti-Semitic work. The piece of literature from which we give the detail of the torture of Jesus by the Jews is marked "International (39) printshop of the 'Mospoligraf.'" The same identification appears on the official Bolshevik *Literaturnaya Gazeta* and many "atheist" publications. And now—here is the citation:

"The Sufferings of Christ for the Salvation of Mankind On the Cross . . . Satan egged on the insolent mob which, even without that, was inflamed by the priests and elders in order that it treat Jesus the more brutally . . . How great was Satan's fury when he saw that all the brutalities of the Jews, whom he in every way incited against Christ, could not evoke the least murmur from the lips of the Savior . . . among all of them from the hypocritical priests to the simplest of the people there was established complete agreement . . . The Savior carried His cross only a few steps when suddenly, due to loss of blood and weakened from all the tortures, He fell unconscious on the ground. How passionately His mother's heart wanted to support Him when He fell under the weight of the heavy cross; to lift His wounded head which at one time had rested on her breast, and to wipe the sweat and blood from His face. Alas! she was deprived of the right." *(Golos Istiny,* Moscow, June 1926, 22, 23)

Ironically, *Golos Istiny* means "The Voice of Veracity."

In addition to the State printshop identification there is a mark on the magazine showing the work was inspected and approved by "Glavlit"—The Chief Administration on the Affairs of Literature and Publications, Organ of the Commissariat of Education.

Stalin's regime has printed an enormous quantity of "Soviet" and bourgeois literature which has been injecting into the mind of

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the masses the belief that "Christ" lived, and has thus induced the feeling that the Jews actually caused his tragic death. It was the Lenin regime, however, that *directly* conveyed to the masses the notion that Jesus Christ was a historical figure. A short while after Lenin took power the Bolshevik Executive Committee of the Soviets headed by Sverdlov put out a calendar which contained a section on the history of the world. In that section the masses were told: "South of Phoenicia, in Palestine, there settled the *Jews,* a people also of the Semitic tribe, who strove to achieve, not technical knowledge, but spiritual and particularly religious development. They were the first to rise to the concept of one God, and among them appeared a whole number of inspired prophets who preached monotheism, and then came Christ who founded Christianity." *(Soviet Kalendar na 1919,* 46)

CHAPTER XXII.

MARXISM—THE LAST BULWARK OF ANTI-SEMITISM AND CHRISTIANITY

1. *The Source of the Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin and Social-Democratic Left Christianism and Christian anti-Semitism*

MARXIST LEFT Christianism and Christian anti-Semitism stem from the founders of the German-nationalist "scientific socialism," Marx and Engels. A combination of both these features in a single paragraph is found in one of Marx's anti-Semitic articles:

"The fact that 1855 years ago Christ drove the Jewish money-changers out of the temple, and that the money-changers of our age enlisted on the side of tyranny happen again chiefly to be Jews, is perhaps no more than a historical coincidence." ("The Russian Loan" N. Y. *Daily Tribune,* Jan. 4, 1856; Marx, *The Eastern Question,* 606). When Marx made the "Temple" story sound authentic and attacked the Jews as the backers of tyrants he not only reinforced the power of Christian Defamation but, implicitly, put a stamp of approval on the age-old Christian persecution and extermination of Jews as economic cannibals of mankind.

Engels in his early years was thoroughly permeated with Church ideology and this is of course perfectly understandable in an intellectually immature youth nurtured on religious myths. The Stalin burocrats, however, printed his early Left Christian delusions without a word of critical explanation. Thus: "Luther had always set before himself the task of returning to true Christianity both in teaching and in life. The peasants desired the same and demanded therefore the reestablishment of primitive Christianity not only in the Church but also in social life. They understood that one must not connect slavery and submis-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

sion, in which they lived, with the teachings of the Bible. Day in and day out they were oppressed and robbed by a gang of overbearing barons and counts . . . This condition was sharply contrary to communal principles of the first Christians and to the Gospel teachings of Christ." (II, R. 402)

Engels defended the mythical Christ against "Jewish blasphemy," and the Stalin editors reprinted this defense without a word of enlightenment to the reader: "I don't know what will become of German literature. We have three talented authors: Karl Beck, Ferdinand Freiligrath and Julius Mosen; the third, it is true, is a Jew; throughout his *Ahasver* the Wandering Jew is challenging Christianity; Gutzkow, who is still more sensible, condemns him for *Ahasver*—an ordinary character, a real Jew—gescheftmacher; Theodore Kreuznach, also a Jew, furiously attacks Gutzkow, in 'Gazette for the elegant world' but Gutzkow stands too high for him. This Kreuznach—a mediocre writer, is praising *Ahasver* to the skies, like a crushed worm, and vomits blasphemy upon Christ as upon a willful, proud god." (Letter to Friedrich Greber, Jan. 20, 1839. *Ib.* 485)

There are phrases scattered in Marx's writings which give historicity to the mythical founder of Christianity. "Society—exclusive of industrial profit—*on the whole* always pays only yearly installments of liquidation. If it were otherwise . . . all the wealth of the entire globe would not have sufficed to *pay the interest* on the smallest capital put into circulation in the times of Christ." (Marx to Engels, Aug. 14, 1851. XXI, R. 248). The learned Marx could have said: in the times of Tiberius. Marx used the expression "in the times of Christ."

Elsewhere we have mentioned that Marx in 1853 stood for the dissolution of the Turkish Empire in Europe. But what did he propose to create in its place? A *Christian State*—and by the Revolution at that!

"Here then is the simple and final solution of the question. History and the facts of the present day alike point to the erection of a free and independent Christian State on the ruins of the Moslem Empire in Europe. The next effort of the Revolution can hardly fail to render such an event necessary . . ." *(N. Y. Daily Tribune,* April 21, 1853, 4, column 5; IX, R. 397)

2. *Bird's Eye View of the Marxist Preservation of Anti-Semitism*

The institution of the Jewish Scapegoat has been a fundamental feature in the social evolution of mankind and is an inseparable component of class society. No condition for the release of the Jewish group from its peculiar thraldom existed either in the Roman Empire or after its break up, in Feudalism. Capitalism gave rise to an industrial proletariat; a condition developed for the abolition of class divisions in society and of all the institutions which buttressed these divisions, including the institution of the Jewish Scapegoat. In 1848

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

there might have developed a possibility of achieving the general emancipation had it not been for the reactionary line of Marx and Engels and their followers. History again presented this possibility in 1871, in 1905, in 1917, 1919, in 1923 and on a dozen other occasions. Each time, however, the Marxist leaders diverted the awakening forces of the proletariat, caused mankind greater and greater social catastrophes and repeated massacres of the Jewish Scapegoat.

It is a paradoxical and yet a historical fact that some of the greatest enemies of the Jewish Scapegoat have been its "friends" or "emancipators" born in its midst, from the Ancient Hebrew scribes and priests to the Margolins and Herzls. But none of these has been as destructive to the Jews as Marx and the diverse Marxist tendencies, particularly the various branches of Jewish Marxism. The Jewish Marxists of all camps provide the safest cover for anti-Semitism. Operating, in the main, among the Jewish workers and Left Jewish bourgeois intellectuals, who are more apt to sense the danger of anti-Semitism than Gentiles, Jewish Marxism deadens the feelings of alertness in many ways. Thus, on the one hand the Bolshevik Jewish Marxists, concealing the anti-Semitic nature of the Sovnarkom regime, recognize that the United States has become the center of anti-Semitism in the capitalist world: "As a result of American imperialist and reactionary policies and practices the center of gravity of international anti-Semitism has shifted from Germany to the United States." (From Resolution on Anti-Semitism by the Second National Convention of the American Jewish Labor Council, *Jewish Life,* August 1949, 29). On the other hand they spread the delusion that the Defamation, which is as firmly implanted in class society as war, privilege and injustice, can be legislated out of existence: "We express our conviction that the most effective method of eliminating anti-Semitism is to outlaw it and subject its perpetrators to punishment by law." *(Ib.).* The deception is conscious, for the Stalin burocrats themselves admit that in the U.S.S.R., where legislation against anti-Semitism hase been in effect for over a quarter of a century, the workers have become more imbued with anti-Semitism than under the Tsar. One could with equal "success" outlaw cancer which can be defeated only through the progress of science. Even when the bourgeoisie sincerely legislates against theft of its property the laws are in themselves powerless. Only the elimination of the condition which produces anti-Semitism and maintains the Jews as a political Scapegoat can put an end to this Ancient institution. In the U.S.S.R. legislation against anti-Semitism has only provided the ruling Marxist clique with an effective screen for anti-Semitic politics at home and abroad.

Marxism has been deliberately deceiving the workers into imagining that anti-Semitism and Fascism represent a combined development whereas in actuality anti-Semitism flourishes in every form of capitalist regime and within the Marxist movement itself.

Various camps of Marxism have hurled charges of anti-Semitism

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

against each other while denying their own anti-Semitism. Every Marxist camp is always on guard against the unmasking of Marx. In the U.S.S.R. a report on the activity of the Party in the Kharkov region in the Spring of 1928 disclosed that one of the members defended his anti-Semitism on the ground that Marx himself was an anti-Semite. The worker was immediately brought to book for his loose tongue: "Karl Marx Set Example as Anti-Semite Communist Says. One member of the Communist Party attempted to justify his anti-Semitism by contending that even Karl Marx had been an anti-Semite. This Marxist, the report says, has been handed over for trial by the Party committee." (*J.D.B.* May 18, 1928)

The Stalin burocracy had no other recourse than to suppress the attempt of domestic anti-Semites to seek shelter in Marx. However it could not prevent the bourgeois Defamers abroad from using Marx's anti-Semitism. They labelled his filthy anti-Jewish vaporings "Jewish Confessions": "Read this amazing quotation printed from an essay by *Karl Marx,* published in 1843, on 'The Jewish Question,' viz: 'Money is the zealous God of Israel . . .' What would we Gentiles *do* without these Jewish Confessions?" ("Jew-Baiting on the Left" *Edmondson Jew-Exposure Patriotic Bulletins,* May 31, 1940)

Every new historical minority which grasped power under the guise of promoting the liberation of mankind automatically became a stronger bulwark of anti-Semitism than the old, discredited minority. So it was when the bourgeoisie came to power and became a more powerful perpetuator of anti-Semitism than the nobility. But the bourgeoisie, too, became an old, discredited minority.

Of all the "progressive" currents—Left bourgeois, Anarchist and Left Labor, represented by Fourier, Proudhon, Bakunin, Marx and others, only the Marxist current has expanded into a mighty force in the arena of history. It is therefore this Left Christian anti-Semitic force, playing a multiple reactionary role, which is serving as the strongest, most effective perpetuator of the centuries' old institution of the Jewish Scapegoat.

3. *The Historical Path Toward The Termination of the Scapegoat Role of the Jews*

In the course of this study the origin, development and importance of anti-Semitism in the evolution of mankind has been investigated, the ethnological nature of the Scapegoat group known as "Jews" established, the role of Marxism in maintaining the Jewish group as a permanent Scapegoat in the Bolshevik State and in the capitalist society exposed and the condition under which anti-Semitism will disappear indicated. The principal points in this part of our study bear restating.

A. The *Jews* have been an ethnological-political enigma for centuries. Originating as one of the Semitic tribes which inhabited the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

areas of the Nile, the Tigris, and Euphrates, the Jews early in their history lost their Semitic "purity" by intermingling with other ethnical groups. In the period of developed Capitalism every race, nation and people became an ethnical mixture, but the Jews more so than any other group. They include all the strains of the White race and to a considerable degree have a Negro and Mongol admixture. They range from the black-eyed, dark-skinned to the fair, blue-eyed and blonde. The Jewish group in its bulk has no territorial base, no common national "blood" ties and is held together only by persecution from without and, to a lesser degree, by lineal, religious and cultural ties within. It is the only social-political, non-ethnical Scapegoat group in all the historical systems of class societies, including the Marxist. The fiction that the Jews are a race, a nation, or a distinct ethnical group in any sense is perpetuated either out of ignorance, or, more often, for political reasons.

The Jews in their outer every day life may seem like most other social groups: many of them are workers, professionals and petty-bourgeois; some are very wealthy; a few receive high administrative posts in the bourgeois and Marxist States. In political reality they are different and stand apart from all the other groups. They are periodically utilized, as though they be a lightning rod, by the privileged elements in both bourgeois and Marxist States to divert the storm of mass unrest and often of revolution. Unlike all the other groups, the Jews, poor and rich, are destined as a *group* for ultimate slaughter through a deliberate *policy* of the ruling elements—not only under Capitalism but also under Marxism as symptoms indicate (pogroms in Daghestan).

B. No phenomenon in the social evolution of man has been more baffling to and relatively more neglected by almost all students of history than anti-Semitism. The most fiendish exterminations of Jews produce no enlightening result among the Jewish bourgeois scholars, and many years after the dreadful Hitler lesson, one of them is impelled to record: "Anti-Semitism is a deplorably neglected area of modern history . . ." (Hannah Arendt, *Commentary*, Feb. 1951, 201). Another Jewish bourgeois scholar offers the following explanation: "The long persistence of anti-Semitism may be due in part to the unwillingness of Jewish scholars and thinkers to deal with it." (*The Jews*, ed. L. Finkelstein, I, xxx). The Jewish bourgeois scholars are not "merely" *unwilling* to make a thorough analysis of anti-Semitism —they *dread* to go to the bottom of the problem, for they sense that the only logical and honest step resulting from such an approach would be a break with all the Christian powers—the ruling powers of the modern world. The Jewish bourgeois scholars, as an element, never did and never would take such a step because, since Constantine, the Jewish bourgeois scholars, economically, politically and traditionally, are chained to the Christian State. In this hopeless condition they have functioned for centuries as a prop to the ruling powers, submit-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ting grumblingly to anti-Semitic hounding and always futilely hoping that some Christian, Jewish or Christian-Jewish agency would eradicate anti-Semitism and put an end to the periodic slaughter of the Jews.

The most erudite Marxists—Engels, Kautsky, Plekhanov, Lenin,—if they knew of the origin, evolution and function of anti-Semitism on the historical scale, they locked this knowledge within their mind. Marx avoided discussing the issue. Marxism as a practicing anti-Semitism of the Left has been constrained to present the Ancient social-political Scapegoat institution as a baffling enigma out of fear of revealing its own anti-Semitic nature. One of the highest departments of learning in the Bolshevik State printed a review of a book on anti-Semitism with a conclusion very depressing to the advanced misled elements subjectively opposed to anti-Semitism: "C. I. Lurie's book demonstrates very well how little has been done by science to explain anti-Semitism; and the disease will rage for a long time until people find its microbe and learn to cure it." *(Annals,* "Journal of General History issued by the Russian Academy of Sciences," R. #3, 248, May 1923). Maxim Gorky, a politically uneducated Gentile supporter of Marxism, perhaps in all frankness wrote "of the causes of anti-Semitism which are generally not understood by me." *(Life and Nationalities,* R. June 1922, 7). But the Gentile Marxist scholars' "ignorance" is an educated avoidance of making a scientific expose of anti-Semitism.

The Marxist Jewish scholars also fear a comprehensive study of anti-Semitism because such study inescapably leads to the exposure of Marx, Engels and the anti-Semitic policies of the Marxist movement. Only a person who politically and ideologically *completely* breaks with the bourgeoisie and Marxism can arrive at the correct analysis of anti-Semitism and take the path leading toward its annihilation.

C. Scientifically, the term *anti-Semitism* is incorrect since the Defamation is not extended to the Arabs and other "Semites." It is levelled only against the virtually non-Semitic group, the Jews. The Defamation of the Jewish group is nearly twenty-five centuries old. It runs in the main through the literature of the Occidental World, is present in drama, art, science, economics and above all in religion and politics. Its germs are found in the Jewish Bible, in the Christian Bible, in the Mohammedan Koran and in Marx's *Capital,* the so-called "Bible of the working class." The basic inventors, builders and sustainers of the Defamation are to be found not among the Crusaders or the Black Hundreds, or the Nazis or other pogromists but among the mightiest thinkers of mankind, non-Jews and Jews. Philosophers, poets, historians, brilliant statesmen, pedagogues, orators, theologians, composers, military geniuses, economists and other men of intellectual pursuit were direct or indirect Defamers. Some of the names are Manetho, Cicero, Bruno, Mahomet, Luther, Napoleon, Gibbon, Buckle, Voltaire, Helvetius, Holbach, Jefferson, Paine, Shakespeare, Chaucer, Goethe, Heine, Fichte, Kant, Fourier, Proudhon, Bakunin,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Lassalle, Marx, Engels, Lafargue, Jaures, Plekhanov, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin, Chopin, Wagner, Blavatsky, Disraeli, Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Tolstoy, Dickens, Hugo, Lamb, Zola, Greeley, Ingersoll, France, Shaw, Dreiser, Herzl, Nordau, Belasco and thousands of other people of distinction, many of them regarded, quite erroneously, as "liberators," "revolutionists," and "progressives." Virtually all of them professed opposition to persecution and falsehood, many parading as "defenders" of the Jews, yet politically functioning as overt or covert, active or passive anti-Semites. Jewish anti-Semitism is an essential part of the Defamation. "The vocabulary of abuse in Hebrew literature—where Jews speak to one another without fear of exaggeration—is a sort you will find only in anti-Semitic literature of the worst type." (Y. Kaufman, *Commentary,* March 1949, 41)

D. Anti-Semitism flows more freely in private channels, except in openly anti-Semitic periods and places (Nazi Germany). Anti-Semitism passes through many stages of evolution. It exists in different forms: crude, refined, active and passive, concealed and open, literary, artistic and profane, Jewish and non-Jewish, bourgeois and Marxist, openly pogromist and ultra-Leftist, shame-faced, vile, humorous, vicious, "friendly," "legal" and "illegal," conscious and unconscious. Anti-Semitism is one of the most ancient and most potent ideological diseases of mankind. In the age of the Marxist State the oldest generators of the Defamation of the Jews are Christianity and its parent and closest political-religious assistant, Judaism; among the newest—Marxism and Anarchism.

Anti-Semitism simmers beneath the surface in the bourgeois-democratic and Marxist society, and is held in readiness by the dominant elements for a full utilization on major occasions. The experience with the Revolution of 1905 and with the Nazi period teaches that the workers must be ideologically forearmed with the knowledge of the nature of anti-Semitism and of the Marxist utilization of this poison—or face defeat. Any attempt to block the exposure of anti-Semitism is an aid to Marxism and Capitalism.

E. Since Capitalism and anti-Semitism are inseparable, all people supporting Capitalism help to perpetuate the Scapegoat institution. Nobody can fight anti-Semitism without fighting Capitalism.

F. Since anti-Semitism is bound up with the root of Marxism, the Marxists cannot avoid shielding and perpetuating anti-Semitism. No one can fight anti-Semitism without fighting Marxism. Just as it is an error to divide the bourgeois press into anti-Semitic and pro-Semitic tendencies—since both stand for Capitalism and therefore both objectively or subjectively uphold this singular Scapegoat institution—so is it equally false to assume that any faction of Marxism ever tends to end anti-Semitism.

G. In the bloody application of the anti-Semitic policy in a given country or region, a section of the Jewish population is destroyed; another section flees to a more or less temporary safety abroad; the

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

third section, primarily because of lack of material means, remains in the pogromed areas, terror-stricken, resigned to whatever may come.

H. The most subtle, and therefore, ideologically, the most elusive forms of anti-Semitism are the Left-most varieties represented by Anarchism, "pink" Liberalism, bourgeois "atheism" and, above all, by *Marxism*. Historically, Marxism, particularly its Jewish sector, is the most dangerous betrayer of the Jews. Disguised as an authentic proletarian science, pretending to struggle for the liberation of the Jews, the Negroes and other oppressed and hounded groups, it disseminates a special Marxist variety of anti-Semitic virus; masquerading as a true proletarian-atheist movement, Marxism subtly disseminates Christian Defamation and Crucifixion pogrom incitement against the Jews. Marxist political treachery is responsible for the pogroms and the general hounding of the Jews since 1847-8. In the face of an appalling fact that a distinct social group of several million stands indicted for nearly two thousand years on an unsubstantiated, obviously fictitious charge of having murdered the founder of Christianity, Marxism not only upholds this indictment but strengthens it by giving it a "progressive," "proletarian" character and is striving to give this "teaching" a world-wide circulation. Marx, Engels, Lenin and other Marxist leaders were *sentimental* Christians. A Left anti-Semitic, Left Christian movement, Marxism is the last bulwark of anti-Semitism and Christianity.

I. The principal physical exterminators of the Jews are Christian countries. In the words of an English theologian, John Jortin, (1698-1770)—"The account of the Jews who have been plundered, sent naked into banishment, starved, tortured, left to perish in prisons, hanged and burnt by Christians, would fill many volumes." *(Remarks on Ecclesiastical History,* II, 237). This was written nearly two centuries before the extermination of six million Jews by the Nazis.

J. While polemizing against Bauer, Marx and Engels falsely asserted that the Christian State can emancipate the Jews: "the completed Christian State not only can emancipate the Jews, but has actually emancipated them and by its nature had to emancipate them." ("Holy Family" III, R. 138). The Christian State can only *change* the form of servitude and oppression of the peasants, the Negroes, the Jews. Christianity is the dominant religion in the capitalist and in the Marxist State systems; it is anti-Semitic—in its mythological origin and its ideological and, to an extent, physical activity for nearly two thousand years. Through a grim irony of history, a branch of Judaism, Christianity became the chief Defamer and exterminator of the Jews. *While the story about the Jews "crucifying our Lord" is fiction, the crucifixion of the Jewish Scapegoat over and over* again by the Christian powers of all shades, including the Left Christian "Soviet" regime, is actual history. One of the basic features of bourgeois-Christian incitement against the artificially-held-together, non-ethnical group, the "Jews," is that this group "oppresses" the Chris-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tian world. Even the term *pogrom* is defined in a way as to reverse the real relation between the Scapegoat and its tormentors and exterminators. Thus: "Pogrom—a bloody uprising where the Jews massacre the Christians, or vice versa." (Leon Brasat, *Synthese de la Question Juive,* 10). The Left refined anti-Semitism of Marx supplies a subtle "theoretical" justification for the anti-Jewish atmosphere of the Christian world by branding the Jews as an "anti-social element of contemporary times" and by advancing the slogan of "emancipation of mankind from Jewry." (Marx, I, R. 394)

K. During Feudalism, or during the bourgeois era prior to the rise of the Marxist State, the center of the Defamation and the concrete action against the Jews moved from one Christian country to another, usually, but not always, coinciding with the shift of the bulk of the Jewish population in the lands of the Diaspora. With the emergence of the Marxist State there have developed two distinct anti-Semitic centers. After 1945 the center of the old, classic, bourgeois anti-Semitism has passed to the United States, a Christian country; the center of Marxist "revolutionary" anti-Semitism has been the Bolshevik State since its founding by Lenin, a Left Christian country.

L. Judaism is the parent of Christianity. From a strong rival during the infancy of the Christian-Jewish sect, Judaism, with the rise of Christianity as the State religion of the Roman slaveholders, and particularly of the Feudal aristocracy, turned into a despised, beggarly, self-abasing lackey of Christianity. Under Capitalism, since the French Revolution, Judaism has been performing the role of a "respectable" menial and shield for Christianity in virtually every field including anti-Semitism, despite the fact that anti-Semitism has entered its ghastliest phase. In the Marxist State, while portions of the Old Testament have been put to use, Judaism as a whole has been hounded both because of the specific Bolshevik anti-Semitic policy and mainly, in order to strengthen the Marxist Left Christian Church.

M. The dechristianization feature in the French Revolution was not the policy of the ruling bourgeois group of France but a momentary concession on its part to the emotional revolutionary forces among the masses and to a handful of basically unenlightened Left bourgeois idealists. The dechristianization was not undertaken as a scientific reeducation of the population but as an administrative move imposed by force upon ignorance. Only scientific analysis and education can terminate the social-political power of all religious dogma. The passing of Christianity and of Judaism in all their forms—from the Roman Catholic to the Marxist—marks the actual passing of anti-Semitism off the stage of history as a living reactionary force.

N. Under Capitalism the ultimate fate of the Jewish bourgeoisie is tied not to the fortunes of the ruling Christian bourgeoisie but to the historical lot of the Jewish masses. Temporarily "associated" with the dominant Gentile capitalists in the division of the fruits of the exploitation of the farm and industrial workers, of the colonial and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

of the Negro masses, the Jewish bourgeoisie is merely being fattened for the kill. By clinging to Capitalism, by passive or "critical" support to Christianity, by perpetuation of Judaism, the Jewish bourgeoisie works for the maintenance of the Christian State, of the institution of the Scapegoat and thus courts the possibility of the total annihilation of the Jews, itself included.

O. Marxism "analyses" the Jewish bourgeoisie as a *bourgeoisie only*, lumping it together with the ruling Christian capitalists. The Jewish bourgeoisie, however, is of a dual character. On the one hand it is a *class* segment of the international bourgeoisie, on the other it is a Defamed "extra-class" part of the traditional social-political Scapegoat. The *class* position of the Jewish bourgeoisie under Capitalism is relatively temporary, with large numbers of Jewish capitalists at various times being eliminated economically, sometimes even physically, because its Scapegoat function is *permanent* and *preeminent* under Capitalism, also under Marxism.

In accord with the varying political needs of the ruling elements, now one function of the Jewish bourgeoisie is brought into play, now the other. Therefore, the proletarian anti-Marxist, anti-capitalist policy must be formulated with respect to the Jewish bourgeoisie in accordance with the specific political function of the Jewish bourgeoisie in a given immediate historical circumstance. In the periods when the anti-Semitic tide recedes (France, Germany, 1914) the proletarian policy is to struggle against the Jewish and the Gentile bourgeoisie along class lines, but when the Gentile ruling section of the international bourgeoisie breaks its "partnership" with the Jewish capitalists, as it must of political necessity, and sharply attacks the entire Jewish Scapegoat (Russia 1903-1907, France during the Dreyfus Affair, Nazi Germany) the proletariat must shift its policy to resist the anti-Semitic tactic by exposing its essence. The tactic then reacts upon the ruling bourgeoisie. To the degree of the enlightenment of the masses on the issue of anti-Semitism, the Defamation and the pogrom tactic boomerangs against its perpetrators. The revolutionary masses, while in the physical sense prevent the slaughter of the Jews, workers and capitalists, in the political sense intensify the struggle for Socialism.

The non-scientific, deceptive designation of the Jewish bourgeoisie as *exclusively* capitalist, along the 1881 Narodnik or 1903-7, 1918-1921, 1933-1945 Marxist *class* patterns, when the Jewish bourgeoisie is not merely Defamed and hounded but is actually slaughtered, is objective or subjective participation in the physical destruction of the Scapegoat as a whole.

P. The Jewish workers are under an altogether different social-political pressure both in the bourgeois and in the Marxist States than are the native Gentile masses. Marxist miseducation has blurred this fact, often through conscious deception. In Tsarist days Lenin wrote: "The gutter press carries on Jew-baiting campaigns, as if the Jewish

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

workers do not suffer in exactly the same way as the Russian workers from the oppression of capitalism and the police government." (*Iskra*, #1, 1900. *Col. Wks.* IV, 63). This was a deliberate lie spread through the Lenin-Plekhanov cooperation. Both Marxist leaders knew that the Jewish workers were far more harshly and mercilessly oppressed than the Russian. The unequal status of the Jewish workers later was carried over into Lenin's State. The Jewish petty-bourgeoisie suffers a heavier fate under both the bourgeois and the Marxist domination than the Gentile petty-bourgeoisie. By trailing behind the Jewish and therefore behind the Christian bourgeoisie, or behind the Christian Marxist State, these two Jewish elements, representing the bulk of the Scapegoat, objectively doom themselves to physical annihilation.

Q. The world working class is the only leading force capable of ending the class-group division of society, the condition which impels the privileged ruling groups to perpetuate the institution of the Jewish Scapegoat. By eradicating Marxism, Anarchism, and all other varieties of reaction from its midst, the working class removes the two oppressive social systems, Marxism and Capitalism, which stifle mankind.

The elimination of Marxism and Capitalism is followed by the removal of territorial political boundaries and national-economic-political barriers which have hitherto maintained the multi-State division of mankind. The Jewish Scapegoat, always an alien element in the nationally-constructed world, is lifted from the Ghetto condition along with the Negro and other segregated and oppressed groups, all becoming united with the rest of humanity in the Non-national Democratic World Workers State. In this the Jewish capitalists escape the threat of extermination and together with the Gentile capitalists become *non-exploiting* members of cooperative mankind.

R. The termination of the national State-division of the world ends the artificial segregation of the most mixed social group, the Jews, and facilitates its absorption by mankind. This phase in the post-Judo-Christian evolution of humanity terminates the existence of the institution of the Jewish Scapegoat. The anti-Jewish Defamation ceases functioning and, together with the Marxist, bourgeois and other States, becomes a relic of history.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

MARXISM AND THE BOLSHEVIK STATE

Workers Democratic World Government

VERSUS

National-Burocratic 'Soviet' and Capitalist Regimes

VOLUME FIVE

A Higher Stage of Mankind's Evolution: the Democratic Workers World State

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

CHAPTER I.

THE SECRET OF MARXISM'S IMMENSE VICTORY

1. *Marx's Dazzling Scientific Facade Screening Anti-Scientific Reactionary Goals*

FOR MANY YEARS following the issuance of the *Communist Manifesto* the number of rival tendencies within the proletariat not only continued to exist but was reinforced with the Lassallean and the Bakunin currents. Lassalle attached the workers to the bourgeois State through alleged expectations that under pressure it would go over to organizing Socialist conditions and thus rescue the workers from wage slavery. The Bakunin tendency maintained that the proletariat could in one leap pass from the capitalist State to a stateless society. For theory both Bakunin and Lassalle depended on Marx. Bakunin translated the *Communist Manifesto* into Russian and expressed high regard for Marx's erudition. In correspondence with Marx, Bakunin referred to him as *teacher*.

Marx's theoretical system contained numerous false thoughts and deliberate frauds, but also a number of correct ideas, many of his own and many which he borrowed from his predecessors and contemporaries. The secret of Marx's eventual triumph over all his rivals lies in the superiority of his "teachings" which seemed a true proletarian-revolutionary science, as against the confused ideas presented by Proudhon, Bakunin, Lassalle and various Left bourgeois reformists.

Expanding Capitalism resulted in the growth of the proletariat. This provided a political field for the fringes of the petty-bourgeoisie chaffing against the oppression by big industry and high finance. The proletarian camp served as a happy hunting ground for an ever-swelling stream of political self-seekers—bourgeois students, intellectuals, and workers escaping from the grind of industry, rising from within the proletariat itself. Essentially composed of political charlatans, the motley host could not operate without dangling before the workers the goal of liberation. And this goal, in a few generalized correct terms, was articulated only by Marx and Engels. The huge throng of demagogues accurately gauged the power Marx's abstract scientific definitions would exercise over the proletariat and made wide use of his works. Naturally they paid evangelical homage to Marx and flourished in the orbit of his authority. Because of the correct points in the ideological equipment of the Marxists, no political tendency inside the working class could escape the shattering impact of their demagogic drive. Due to the fact that Marx's politics reflected the German national spirit, his name for a long time rose triumphantly higher in Germany than elsewhere. And as a consequence of Bismarck's victory over France and of the sanguinary butchery of the Paris proletariat and the resulting shift of the political center of the pseudo-revolutionary movement to Germany, Marxism became the dominant political system within the international working class.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

While the Marxist system was mainly in its ideological stage, one could have hardly grasped, outside of Marx and Engels and perhaps a few of their most brilliant disciples, that Marxism wears a cloak composed of a few abstractly correct scientific definitions to disguise many false notions which have been used to advance the bureaucratic-nationalist ambitions of Marxism's leading proponents. Only after the Marxist goal materialized in Russia could a scientific analysis of Marxism be arrived at and the separation of its correct ideas from its deceptions undertaken.

Many people have been under the impression that it was Marx who discovered the class struggle. However, during one of his rare modest moments Marx stated: "And now as to myself, no credit is due to me for discovering the existence of classes in modern society nor yet the struggle between them. Long before me bourgeois historians had described the historical development of this class struggle and bourgeois economists the economic anatomy of the classes." (Letter to Weydemeyer, March 5, 1852. *Sel. Cor.* 57)

Marx, in collaboration with Engels, rose above his predecessors and contemporaries in that he introduced the *objective,* dialectic-materialist method of understanding social evolution, despite the fact that in contradiction to this method he pursued subjective and therefore reactionary policies and presented false explanations in each and every important historical situation. Marx made a profound study of the mechanics of the bourgeois system of production and organized a systematic analysis of surplus value, the unpaid portion of value created by the wage worker and appropriated and accumulated as capital by the bourgeoisie. It was Marx who first explained the nature of surplus value; although the rudiments of this understanding existed before his time. This fact is verifiable from many sources. Engels says in the preface to the II Volume of *Capital:* "It is therefore evident that even Adam Smith knew 'the source of the surplus-value of the capitalists,' and furthermore also that of the surplus-value of the landlords."

Many ideas in *Capital,* Marx's most ponderous work, did not originate with him, as we have pointed out. But apparently the abstract theoretical prognostication of the eventual climax of the economic and social contradictions of Capitalism belongs solely to Marx. His abstractly-revolutionary prognosis did not prevent Marx from consciously adopting concretely counter-revolutionary policies which aided the expropriators, particularly the German, to maintain the system of capitalist expropriation and to artificially postpone the knell of Capitalism.

The principal attraction in the Marxist system for the advanced workers, particularly in the hectic period of the collapse of Capitalism, was his theory of a proletarian State. That he had in mind the ultimate establishment of a proletarian State *with himself wielding dictatorial power,* using Germany as the dominating national center,

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

he did not divulge publicly, though he left behind enough documentary evidence to show that this was precisely what he and Engels had been looking forward to, particularly since the formation of the First International.

Marx and Engels shed more light on the origin and function of the State than the world had ever seen before; however, their view contains very important misconceptions. For example, they failed to realize that the bourgeois State *always* guards the interests of the bourgeoisie; they imagined, instead, that during certain periods of struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat the capitalist state "acquires, for the moment, a certain independence in relation to both." (Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State).* Nor did they firmly grasp the fact that personal bourgeois dictators who rise to insure the stability of capitalist property represent the interests of the upper circle of owners of this property. Failing to understand that Louis Bonaparte really represented the financiers and industrial magnates of France, Marx erroneously concluded that Louis Bonaparte represented the immense mass of the *small peasants! (The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte).* Marx, as we have seen, incorrectly evaluated the class nature of the Paris Commune, calling what was in reality a Left bourgeois regime, a workers State.

Beclouded by German proletarian nationalism, Marx and Engels were utterly unable to grasp the idea which Trotsky was later able to conceive thanks to his *Russian* proletarian nationalism, that the form of State they planned for advanced Germany could be instituted in a backward country like Russia.

Scientific thoughts are to be found in Marx's "Author's Preface" to his work *The Critique of Political Economy.* It is these and similar ideas that distinguish Marx as one of the explorers of history's vast unknown, a thinker whose knowledge, however, advanced side by side with the deterioration of his political character. And it was these revolutionary, *maximum program* generalizations, coupled with a more or less accurate probing into the mechanics of the bourgeois exploitation of the working class, that served Marx and his burocratic disciples as an inviting facade for captivating the proletarian vanguard and thus, undetected, to pursue their burocratic nationalist ambitions.

2. *The Lesson of Marx's Formula "Dictatorship of the Proletariat"*

The formula "Dictatorship ol the Proletariat" originated in the burocratic mind of Marx. Lenin expounded this formula to the Russian workers as supposedly meaning that they would become dictators over the bourgeoisie and the landlords and at the same time would enjoy the widest democracy in their own ranks. After October the shibboleth "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" automatically became a weapon in the hands of the Bolshevik leaders to suppress the incipient democracy within the proletariat. The dictatorial power was wielded from the outset by a small segment of the proletariat, not only against

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the landlords and the bourgeoisie but against the rest of its own class. The concretization of Marx's formula proves that dictatorship—any dictatorship, bourgeois or Marxist—is often injurious to the capitalists and landlords but is *always* detrimental to the interests of the oppressed.

A dictatorship always carries with it a secret repressive apparatus. The lesson to be drawn from Lenin's application of the principle of "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" is that the workers on the way to emancipating themselves and all the oppressed require no institutions such as the Cheka, no secret police with its torture and execution chambers. In proportion to the growth of self-discipline of the organized masses and of the regularity and growth of production, the open public supervision over the unruly social elements steadily lessens and is finally eliminated.

Those Marxist burocrats who were well educated and who made it their foremost task to read everything Marx and Engels wrote could not have failed to grasp the hidden meaning in the formula "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" or in the slogan "Working men of all countries unite!" In political practice the formula and the slogan meant: Workers, unite with the American slaveholders (Mexican War), with the German bourgeoisie and the Hungarian and Polish pogromists (1848), with the Hapsburg oppressors of the Italian masses (the Italian War), with the American capitalists (Civil War), unite with Bismarck and the German bourgeoisie (Franco-Prussian War), with the Trochu-Thiers regime ("Vive la Republique!"), with the Sultan of Turkey (Russo-Turkish War), with the Kaiser Wilhelm II and German imperialism (Engels' position 1891) but follow, in the final analysis, Marx and Engles for the eventual overthrow of German private, bourgeois economy and for the formation of a German Workers State, with Poland, Hungary, Bohemia and other countries as German satellites, under the personal "dictatorship of the proletariat" of Marx and Engels. History substituted Russia for Germany, Lenin and Trotsky for Marx and Engels, and eventually placed Stalin as the culmination of the expression of personal Marxist "Dictatorship of the Proletariat."

3. *Proletarian Political Leaders Must Never Occupy Posts of Power*

Through all class societies the concept has prevailed that the political leaders assume posts of governmental authority. This concept expresses the interests of a minority fraction of a class. It has been deeply implanted in the mind since humanity split into antagonistic social classes and groups. Always implied, but never explicitly stated, this thesis has been a central doctrine of Marxism—both of Social Democracy as well as of Bolshevism. Nothing enters so completely into the personal lives of burocratic political leaders, bourgeois or proletarian, as power. Limited in number, they necessarily form a distinct caste of professional governing burocrats. This truth has been

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

clearly illustrated by the experience of all the bourgeois countries and starkly reiterated by the October Revolution.

The proletariat may entrust its political leadership only with the task of ideological *guidance*, never with administrative functions of the proletarian Party and State. This ideological guidance falls off with the diminishing function of the proletarian-revolutionary State which from the outset to its end is democratically administered by the workers themselves. In contrast to the above ideas, in the Marxist system the political leadership is closely identified with the controlling mechanism of the organizations it heads. The leadership supervises all the properties of the organization, without any check or control from the ranks, is in fact a practicing burocracy which transfers itself and its methods into the administrative machinery of the Marxist State. Every Marxist leader, whether Bolshevik or Social Democrat, is imbued with the thought of assuming a post in the State if his Party takes power.

Historical experience proves that all talk about democratic elections, about rule by the majority, about recall from office by the people who elect the official, about popular referendum and Workers Democracy, about every worker being eligible to run the State (Lenin) is at bottom a fraud if a distinct top-heavy social group, the political leadership, is stationed at the control of the State.

The experience of the Bolshevik Revolution demonstrates that of all the elements, the most devoted, enduring, self-sacrificing, immune from burocratic virus, is the revolutionary rank-and-file. Less reliable because of muddled ideology are the backward masses. *Utterly* unreliable is the Marxist leadership. Burocratically corrupt in all periods of its hundred years history, the Marxist leadership is the most treacherous element within the working class. A Marxist leader is accustomed to think of himself wielding power.

With the proletarian-revolutionary leadership confining itself to its elementary task of guidance, the workers elect people to serve as State functionaries out of the revolutionary rank-and-file. The elected person fills his post for a *specifically limited* period, upon the expiration of which he yields the post, and under no circumstances returns to the administration until all the other workers have participated in the running of the State. Steadily the general mass rises ideologically and politically to the level of the revolutionary vanguard and establishes a rotating system of elected functionaries.

One of the features of the so-called "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" is its perpetuation of one person in political leadership under the guise of supposedly free approval by the Party members and by the masses. The proletarian-revolutionary movement must banish the practice of the permanently "elected" leader and, instead, establish a rotating political leadership with complete changes of personnel at brief intervals. A worker who is elected to a post for a period of a year and then leaves the post will have no inducement to set up a

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

personal burocratic machine. He retires from the administrative scene. A political *leader,* however—if he is allowed to occupy a post even for a year—will still remain prominently on the scene and, in consequence, would benefit from a personal machine in the government. When Lenin was setting his trap for the Russian masses in 1917 he shrewdly identified the Party burocracy with the workers: *"We ourselves,* the workers, will organize large-scale production on the basis of what capitalism has already created." *(State and Revolution).* With the phrase "we ourselves" eliminated, the rest becomes correct. Since the main problem of the Democratic Workers World State is not the hounding of the opponents but the building, as rapidly as possible, of a solid economic foundation for the liberation of the oppressed, workers are elected to posts not on the basis of quality of good policemen but of proficiency in their respective fields.

4. *On Some Terms Employed by the Marxists*

Marxism has accumulated an ideological arsenal of words, phrases and slogans, either borrowed from other classes or coined by the Marxist leaders themselves. The shibboleths have been blindly accepted and repeated with no examination as to whether or not they are correct. Some of these terms are used in a damaging way to the masses, as, for example, *sectarianism* and *internationalism.* The term *sectarianism* was borrowed by Marx from the Church vocabulary. It was first used by the Presbyterians against the Independents to describe them as bigoted and narrow-minded. Marx adopted it as a frame-up word in his politics and employed it chiefly against his opponents the Lassalleans; this usage was taken over by the Marxist burocrats. Before 1917 Trotsky used it against Lenin, speaking of the Bolshevik "policy of circular selectiveness and sectarian irreconcilability." *(Nashe Slovo,* July 23, 1915). With profound contempt he spoke of "all the little points of their sectarian program."

Whenever Marxist burocrats are alarmed over the emergence of an oppositional tendency, one of the measures they take to keep their followers away from it is to brand it as *sectarian* by which they seek to convey the notion that the tendency is permeated with factional exclusiveness, with blind attachment to fetishism, with disregard for the living issues of political life and therefore against the interests of the masses. When some revolutionary workers objected to Olgin's "proletarian" interpretation of Blok's Left-Christian poem "The Twelve," he lashed out against them and called them "sectarians."

One of the misleading terms in the Marxist lexicon is *internationalism.* The Marxist followers are induced to believe that the term means the basic unity of interests and inspirations of the proletarians of all countries. In actuality the word in Marxist politics denotes relations among the leading burocrats of various nations and invariably on an unequal basis. The Stalin regime is the material concretization

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mozilla/5.0
IP_ACCEPT-

of this *internationalism*. The term actually expresses the condition of division of society into nations. The interests of the masses call for the elimination of *all* national boundaries, politically and economically, under democratic world proletarian direction and guidance.

All terms of Marxism must be reexamined and those which are false rejected.

5. *A Brief Summary of the Career of Marx and Engels*

Marx and Engels were of the generation that was strongly influenced by the turbulent events of the Great French Revolution. They were infected by the power-passion of the bourgeois civilian and military leaders of the Revolution. Incomparably profound students, politically enterprising and bold, they logically chose their German fatherland as the prospective basis of their operations. Analyzing the trend of the economic and social forces that had burst the aristocratic shackles in France, they correctly concluded that Germany was approaching a bourgeois revolution. Their error lay in the expectation that the German Left bourgeoisie, which they sought to lead, would emulate the militancy of the petty-bourgeoisie in the French Revolution.

Planning before 1848 to establish a Great-German bourgeois dictatorship on the Jacobin model, Marx and Engels observed the explosive revolutionary power in the proletariat and realized that they had to prevent its independent action by tying it to the petty-bourgeoisie. Hence, while standing at the head of the political organization of the petty-bourgeoisie, they simultaneously won leadership and confidence in the most advanced proletarian movement. After 1848, having lost faith in the Left bourgeoisie and, on the other hand, seeing no proletarian upheaval in Germany in the near future, Marx and Engels retired from organized political struggle and engaged in Liberal journalism up to the founding of the First International which they joined and in which they immediately assumed leadership. With this political instrument largely under their control they lived in expectation of a proletarian revolution in Germany, hoping to establish their personal dictatorship there. Circumstances over which Marx had no control brought about a proletarian uprising in France instead. Standing in the realm of theoretical thinking high above the leaders of the Paris Commune, Marx and Engels betrayed the masses, who were misled by the Commune, by default and gained tremendous prestige by hindsight advice to the leaders of the Communards.

Despite the subsequent dissolution of the International, Marx's star rose in France, in Russia, in America, and particularly in Germany and Austria. Bowing to, and at the same time helping to build his authority, political fortune-seekers journeyed to London for Marx's advice and for his blessing to use his name in corralling the workers.

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

:-AGENT = Mozilla/5.0
), deflate HTTP_ACCEPT-

6. *Marxism and the Development of Mankind's Social Consciousness*

Although Marxism as a system is a colossal pseudo-scientific swindle, it represents in certain ideological aspects a higher stage in the evolution of social consciousness than all the preceding stages. Prior to the French Revolution social consciousness had not risen above the level of schematic thinking of the bourgeois philosophers and encyclopedists who divided society into the aristocrats, the clergy, and the "people," this last category being comprised of the peasants, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In the process of the French Revolution the level of thinking rose to counterpose the bourgeois nation to the aristocracy and clergy and the creation of the Republic. Within the Republic certain tendencies, especially the one represented by Babeuff, recognized that the bourgeois nation was itself divided into possessors of property and propertyless masses. Then came the so-called "utopian Socialists," specifically Fourier and his followers, Considerant and others, who, their thinking though clouded, were able to recognize that they lived in a capitalist society with owners of industry and commercial enterprises on the one hand and propertyless workers on the other. Some of these "utopian Socialists" protected their capitalist class by means of anti-Semitism and air-castle "Socialism."

Upon their heels came Marx and Engels. They grasped the independent role of the proletariat and carried the analysis of the mechanics of capitalist economy to scientific ends, whereas the bourgeois economists assigned a fictional function to the capitalist in production to justify his exploitation of the workers. Marx's and Engels' thinking, though it reached in their epoch the highest level of social consciousness as compared with all the preceding stages, was arrested and kept in check by several strong subjective shackles: German nationalism, lust for personal power, anti-Semitism and political dishonesty.

Because his mind was imbued with reactionary aims, Marx never advanced much beyond the narrow bounds of national ideology. With his correct perception that proletarian revolution would terminate the exploitation of man by man was coupled the false notion that humanity would continue divided into nations. Apparently thinking of the experience of the French Revolution, which was a national movement, Marx spoke of the "Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels." *(Communist Manifesto)*. This indicates that in his view proletarian revolution would occur in one portion of the world, while the rest of the world could serve as a refuge to the counter-revolutionaries. He did not view the proletariat as a *world body* but as a conglomerate of *national units*—even in the period of the overthrow of Capitalism: "Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word." *(Ib.)*. Due to his nationalist perspective Marx did not think of forming a non-national world pro-

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

' = Mozilla/5.0
ITTP_ACCEPT-

letarian State bank but conceived of "a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly." *(Ib.)*. The reactionary national-proletarian concepts that were expressed in the *Communist Manifesto* and Marx's unexpressed thesis that the national-proletarian revolution was to be captained by unscrupulous burocrats were not readily discernible because of the phrases about raising "the proletariat to the position of the ruling class, to win the battle of democracy." In the present light it becomes clear that it was the reactionary concepts in the *Communist Manifesto* and this unspoken thesis that imbued Lenin in 1917; and, with the aid of demagogic promises to raise the Russian workers to the position of masters of Russia and to institute proletarian democracy, he secured their support for the establishment of a Russian Marxist State.

CHAPTER II.

THE CLASS NATURE OF THE BOLSHEVIK STATE

1. *Fractions of Classes Wielding Power*

BOURGEOIS DEFINITIONS of the State either ignore or minimize the class features. Thus the State is described as "A political body, or body politic; any body of people occupying a definite territory and politically organized under one government, esp. one that is a sovereign, or not subject to external control." *(Webster's,* 2461). The Marxists, though recognizing that the State is a class entity, offer a generalization; "According to Marx, the state is an organ of class *rule* . . ." (Lenin, *State and Revolution).* The Marxists ~~omit the~~ concrete fact that State power has never ~~been wielded by an entire~~ ruling class. This omission is due to the narrow ideological training stemming from the one-sided formulation in the very opening section of the *Communist Manifesto:* "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." As a matter of scientific fact, the history of society consists not only of struggles between classes but of a great variety of struggles, struggles between the dominant and oppressed groups within one and the same class, struggles within groups, of similar elements within the same class. The War of 1914 was not a struggle between classes but among top sections of the bourgeoisie of different countries. The Wars of the Roses were struggles within the camp of the aristocracy and so were a thousand other wars in the long era of Feudalism. Marx's oversimplification of historical struggles in society helped a group within the proletariat to seize control of power and economy under the slogan of power to the entire proletariat, and thus secure a privileged position.

Political expropriation of the majority of a ruling class by a handful of its members or by a single member is not merely a common

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

R-AGENT = Mozilla/5.0
), deflate HTTP_ACCEPT-

phenomenon in history but, indeed, represents the fundamental form of exercise of class power throughout history. This was true for the slave State of antiquity, for Feudal society, and holds true for bourgeois society. Often the distinctive, individualistic dictatorial trends and practices are clearly visible. In Ancient times the Babylonian, Assyrian and other Empires, the Age of the Tyrants in Greece, the Empire of Alexander, Rome and Carthage, the barbarian kingdoms, Byzantium, the Mongol and Ottoman Empires, the Age of the Despots in Italy, Napoleon are examples of this expropriation.

In the Feudal system the land-owning aristocracy was the ruling class. In England according to tradition the land nominally belonged to the king and was held by the nobles as a gift from him. William the Conqueror, however, put this nominal relation into actual practice and expropriated the English landlords not only politically but also economically, confiscating their estates and distributing them to another set of nobles. These newly-created earls and barons actually received the land from the King and the whole English society was frequently reminded through his liberal use of the axe and the hangman's rope that he was the sole Master of the realm. The King wielded his power through a State which rested on a Feudal system of economy in which the landlords, in a historical sense, were the ruling class of England.

In the Russia of the Muscovy Tsardom, the boyars, composing an aristocratic order of landowners, were the ruling class. Owing to the Feudal methods of production they were the overlords and exploiters of the peasantry. Yet during the ruthless reign of Ivan the Terrible the majority of the ruling class of Russia was subjected to the bloody tyranny of the Tsar and his vicious oprichina—a group of favorite boyars about six thousand strong. The rest of the ruling class was brutally oppressed, terrorized and decimated through frightful purges and massacres. Moreover, Ivan the Terrible, the greatest of the boyars, favored the merchants and townspeople at the expense of the ruling class of Russia—whom he feared and despised.

Nor were the boyars particularly happy later under the iron heel of Peter the Great. One illustration will suffice to show how the ruling class fared under his dictatorship even in matters of personal appearance. The beard was a tradition in old Russia; it was regarded with veneration and even with religious awe as the essential part of "the image of God." The longer a boyar's beard the greater respect his appearance commanded. But Peter regarded the beard as a symbol of backwardness, of arch-conservatism. Bent on modernizing Russia he resolved that the beard must go. He assembled the most eminent boyars and with his own hand clipped their beards as they sat trembling with helpless rage and terror.

The king who first reduced the nobles of France to obedience was Louis XI. Surrounded by advisers recruited from the lower classes, inclined to consort with the emerging bourgeoisie rather than with

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

NT = Mozilla/5.0
HTTP_ACCEPT-

his own class, dressed like the poorest of the towns-people, Louis XI never ceased hounding the aristocracy, historically the ruling class of France.

Bourgeois society reproduces the phenomenon of the seizure of political power by a minority of the ruling class. In the countries of military or Fascist dictatorship and in capitalist democracies, the invisible rulers are the financial oligarchs, the heads of powerful cartels and monopolies. The oligarchy imposes its will not only upon the proletariat and the petty-bourgeoisie but also upon the rest of the ruling class. Moreover, this financial portion of the bourgeoisie controls the bourgeois ruling class of the backward nations and colonies.

In all instances, the direct or indirect, covert or overt, bloody or tempered exercise of power by a minor portion of the ruling class pursues a two-fold aim: to enhance its own power and privileges and to preserve the *class* economic base, the foundation of the social existence of the class as a whole. *Usurpation of power by a clique or an individual changes neither the class nature of the State nor the class character of economy on which the State rests.*

2. *Common Features of Minority Rule*

Minority rule in the Ancient, the Feudal and the bourgeois States is carried out by means of a burocratic apparatus. The burocracy may be a combination of various social elements, but in the main it is an integral part of the ruling class. In Ancient Rome the State burocracy embraced the patrician class, a portion of plebeians and freedmen. The burocracies of the Feudal States, too, contained heterogeneous elements, although the backbone was formed of the landed gentry. France in the days of the Great Revolution was governed by a burocracy made up of robust elements of the bourgeoisie and fragments of the Feudal aristocracy. As the French bourgeois State staggers into the final stage of decay, its burocracy, still predominantly capitalist, is interspersed and at times even headed by burocrats recruited from the aristocracy of labor. The burocracy of the British Empire is a conglomeration of the most diverse class origins ranging from the old aristocratic families down to the members of the British working class. Modern British royalty, however, as well as the entire titled nobility of England, by their property status are not Feudal lords but bourgeois investors in capitalist enterprises. Although it contains various elements, fundamentally the burocracy of the British State is a *capitalist* burocracy because the basis of this State is the bourgeois form of economy.

In Russia following the abolition of serfdom capitalist economy continued to develop and due to that economic transformation the tsars, though of boyar lineage and though exercising as much of an autocratic suzereinity as their forefathers, ruled over a capitalist, not a Feudal State. Even back in Feudal times the Russian State burocracy counted within its ranks many members of the lower classes. In the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ER-AGENT = Mozilla/5.0
ip, deflate HTTP_ACCEPT-

last phases of Tsarist Russia, the State burocracy was largely capitalist in its social composition.

After the March 1917 revolution and up to October nothing essentially changed in the capitalist nature of the economy of Russia. Within the State, except for the removal of the crowned ruler and the induction of a number of labor supporters of Capitalism, the burocracy remained unaltered, maintaining its previous class connections and its capitalist class character. As under the Tsar, its basis was the privately-owned economy of Russian industrial and agricultural capitalism.

Prior to the Bolshevik Revolution, private ownership of economy as the fundamental basis of the State, had existed for thousands of years. No previous class upheavals in history ever abolished the institution of private ownership of land and industry. The October Revolution crossed the Rubicon of private ownership of the means of production and distribution. Almost instantaneously, in the historical measurement of time, it unfolded the State form of basic economy. A new State, never known before to mankind, arose on this economic basis. In itself State ownership or control of some property is not a novelty: to a limited degree it existed in antiquity, particularly in Greece and Rome, also during the Feudal times. Under Capitalism it has been widespread. But the State form of property in the Ancient, Feudal and bourgeois societies is not the *basic* form of economy. The fundamental form is *private* ownership, while the State enterprises in all those societies have no function other than as a prop to private economy.

The proletariat, obviously, cannot liberate itself and the oppressed national groups on a private economy basis because such a basis automatically divides society into propertied capitalists and propertyless workers. The only form which can safeguard society against the expropriation and accumulation of *social* wealth by *private* individuals is the State form under which no person is allowed to own the means of production or distribution of the necessities of life. Since the bourgeois State functions to preserve its privately-owned economic foundations, a different class State is required to turn the entire private economy into State industry. No other class can perform this transformation than the proletariat.

The Bolshevik Revolution was piloted by a leadership which linked itself to the proletariat not only through the predominantly proletarian composition of the Bolshevik Party but also politically through a promise-program to remove the capitalist State and private economy in Russia and to form a democratic proletarian State. The first part of the promise-program was fulfilled, and to that extent the Bolshevik leadership went along with the historical course of the workers. But in all other points of its pre-October pledges, the interests of the leadership and of the workers diverged. The burocratic leadership of the proletariat established itself in power as a Russian State

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

burocracy, and since under the new form of economy there was no group of magnates of private industry, the Bolshevik burocrats themselves formed the minority of the class that had placed them in power.

3. *The Marxist Form of Economic Control*

When a Caesar or a Napoleon establishes a personal dictatorship, he does not take control of private lands, manufacture, and shops, but he does become the complete master of all State properties. He acquires these properties not by edict yet in actuality they are his personal possessions. The popular delusion is that there is no personal connection between this "public" property and the dictator's power. In reality the connection is there and his power automatically extends over all public property.

When the private economic system is abolished all economy becomes public, that is, becomes the property of the State, theoretically but not at once practically under the control of the masses. At the time the Bolshevik burocracy stole the power of the State, it factually deprived the masses of practical control of State property, although legally and theoretically the entire economy and land continued to be designated as theirs.

The minorities of the Ancient, Feudal and bourgeois classes in seizing control of the State automatically came into possession of all State property, and so it is with the proletarian minority which, having no private industrial enterprises of its own, depends for privileges and well-being entirely on State economy.

The Tsar knew that his power had been handed down to him from his forefathers. The old boyar order was a dim memory, and he harbored no hatred towards their modern descendants. He despised and feared the workers and peasants and held the bourgeoisie in contempt, but he was quite conscious that he never stole power from any of these classes. Nor did the Russian and other capitalists ever steal political power from the proletariat. Either through the application of force or economic and social pressure, they wrested it from the Feudal lords who in the end themselves became capitalists and established unity of interests with the bourgeoisie. But Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin were keenly aware of the fact that they robbed the working class of its power, its rights and its economy, and were depriving it of a large portion of the daily fruits of its labor. Hence their unparalleled dread and hatred toward the working class.

4. *"State Capitalism"*

No State has been the subject of such widespread, intense discussion and study with respect to its class character as the Bolshevik State. It is evident that the enigma would not have arisen had there been no Brest Policy, no Sovnarkom deals with imperialism and no saddling of the proletariat and the peasantry with an oppressive buroc-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

racy. There is a wide range of definitions and interpretations of the nature of the Bolshevik State. The Stalin burocracy declares that Russia has reached the stage of Socialism. The bourgeoisie labels Stalin's oppression and tyranny as "Communism." The bourgeois ideologists often call the Bolshevik system totalitarian in allusion to some features common to both Bolshevism and Fascism such as a highly-centralized regime under one-man rule. This view is shared by many anti-Bolshevik Marxists.

The notion that Bolshevik Russia is a Fascist country can be dismissed with a few words. Under Fascism, in the light of unquestionable evidence, the financial and industrial magnates maintain their private economy through an efficient consolidation of cartels and other forms of concentration and centralization of *private capital.* Not only is the capitalist system of production and exchange legally and factually maintained under a Fascist rule but it is considerably strengthened through the transformation of the Fascist leaders themselves into wealthy private owners of industry. In Bolshevik Russia, on the other hand, even the top burocrat, Stalin, does not legally possess a single industrial enterprise.

The most popular thesis commonly advanced by tendencies which are widely divergent on many other issues is that the Bolshevik State represents "state capitalism." This thesis was put forth very shortly after the October Revolution by some Social Democrats. The Kronstadters, sorely perplexed by the anti-proletarian policy of the Lenin-Trotsky regime, decided that the new system was "state capitalism" *(Kronstadt Izvestia,* March 8, 1921). Again and again the thesis has been appearing, sometimes as a mere label, often worked out in great detail with figures on production and with facts on the rapacious appropriation of the workers' products by the minority in power.

The Anarchists, who also concentrate exclusively on the despotism of the Bolshevik burocracy and overlook the important fact that it operates on a different economic foundation than the bourgeoisie, "analyze" the Bolshevik foundation as a State form of Capitalism: "There is no Communism in Russia, which is an autocracy more absolute than any Czar's. It is an absolute despotism politically, and the crassest form of State Capitalism economically." (Emma Goldman, *The American Mercury,* April 1935)

Some bourgeois anti-Semitic ideologists who attempt to sell Christian "Socialism" to the masses also label the Bolshevik system as State Capitalism: "Then what is Bolshevism? It is State Capitalism, run by Jews in the Jewish interests." (A. S. Leese, *Bolshevism is Jewish,* 3)

History knows two forms of State capitalism, one of which exists in all capitalist countries, and the other which was introduced by Lenin in 1921 known as the NEP.

In the pre-October era the understanding of the term *state capitalism,* sometimes called "State Socialism," among Marxists and some Liberals, was that a portion of capitalist economy was State-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

owned. This portion included the post office, in some countries railroads and other means of public conveyance, tobacco monopoly, distilleries, a limited number of foundries, mines, and retail shops, and a few of the industries supplying the needs of the Army and Navy. Engels in *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* developed an unscientific notion that the process of taking over the management of production would be carried out by the *Capitalist* State. "In one way or another, with trusts or without, the official representative of capitalist society, the State, is finally constrained to take over the management of production. This necessity of conversion into state property makes itself evident first in the big institutions for communication: the postal service, telegraphs and railways."

Kautsky on the other hand rejected this false notion, without stating, however, whose notion it was. He correctly explained that under Capitalism the State entered the economic field in a small way only, merely to assist private industry: "When the contemporary State takes over certain branches of economy or economic functions it does this not for the purpose of limiting capitalist exploitation but for the purpose of safeguarding the capitalist mode of production, to strengthen it, or in order that it itself participates in this exploitation, to increase thereby its income and reduce the expenses borne by the class of the capitalists for its maintainence." *(The State of the Future,* R. 30). In another work Kautsky also quite correctly observed: "The State has never carried on the nationalizing of industries further than the interests of the ruling classes demanded, nor will it ever go further than that. So long as the property-holding classes are the ruling ones, the nationalization of industries and capitalist functions will never be carried so far as to injure the capitalists and landlords or to restrict their opportunities for exploiting the proletariat." *(The Class Struggle,* 110); "as long as the *possessing* classes are at the same time also the *dominant* ones, the transfer of economic enterprises and functions into the hands of the State will never advance to a degree where it could considerably harm private capital and agriculture, as a whole, and to limit its domination and the possibility to exploit labor." (31)

Thus, in the pre-October era, Kautsky and most Marxists recognized State capitalism or "State Socialism" as merely an auxiliary to the private bourgeois economy. During the 1914-1918 war the concept was expanded to include the regulation and disciplining, but not expropriation, of private capitalist industry by the capitalist State administration.

The "State capitalism" introduced by Lenin in 1921 was the very opposite of the State capitalism in bourgeois countries and in reality was not State capitalism but limited private economy. As a temporary aid to Russian State economy Lenin allowed a certain amount of private industry and trade by former shop and factory owners. He even went as far as to temporarily denationalize some of the State plants. For example, "The plant, formerly Erikson, producing tele-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

graph equipment was denationalized in October." *(Pravda,* Dec. 8, 1921)

One minor feature in this "State capitalism" was the concessions to be granted to foreign imperialists. These concessions never actually materialized. The main feature, however, was the temporary legalization of internal private trade, allowing the peasantry, after deduction of taxes, to dispose of their surplus grain on the open market and the merchants of the towns to sell their wares.

The State retained the monopoly of export and import of goods, the ownership of railways, water transport, banks and heavy industry. The first and middle stages of the NEP represented the unfolding and maturity of this form of "State capitalism" (March 1921-October 1928). The last stage (First Five-Year Plan, October 1928-December 1932) marked its decline and elimination, and the rise of a powerful State economy.

The objectives behind actual State capitalism and Lenin's policy were diametrically opposite. While the capitalist rulers use the State-owned enterprises as crutches for lame private economy, the Bolshevik rulers permitted the temporary existence of private enterprises to nourish their young State economy.

Some of the theories of "state capitalism" act as a cover for the Bolshevik burocracy. By means of paper and ink, the Russian State economy is pictured as *capital,* the surplus product appropriated by Stalin's burocracy as *surplus value* which under Capitalism the private owner extracts from his worker, and the Russian workers are viewed as pre-October proletarians—with the difference that they are now working for a "state capitalist class." But equation of Capitalism with the economy and State of post-October Russia is no scientific analysis. The whale can be likened to the shark because of certain common aquatic habits. Yet a physiological study discloses that it is a mammal, a species of the highest class of vertebrates which includes man. To the superficial eye the whale is a fish. That Stalin and his burocracy are exploiting the masses is a fact, but the Feudal kings and the landed aristocracy also exploited the masses and so did the American slaveholders. Parasitic layers in society are formed through various systems of exploitations. Marx correctly designated the term *surplus value* as that portion of unpaid labor, which the capitalist extracts from the wage workers on the basis of his privately-owned enterprise. Therefore, to keep matters straight, the extraction of surplus value is a method of *capitalist* exploitation governed by specific economic laws of Capitalism. Neither the Feudal lords nor the American plantation owners ever extracted surplus value from their slaves. Under the condition of burocratic usurpation of power in the system of State economy the amount of *products* to go to the burocracy is determined not by the laws of Capitalism, such as supply and demand, world market and other features of distinctly bourgeois economy, but by the arbitrary orders of the powerful Politburo.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

5. *"The Dictatorship Over the Proletariat"*

Lenin and other Bolshevik leaders called their personal burocratic rule the *dictatorship of the proletariat.* Certain Liberals and Marxists, revolted by the tyrannical rule of the usurping burocrats, declare that the Bolshevik State is not a dictatorship *of* the proletariat but *over* the proletariat. Predicating their analysis of the class nature of the Bolshevik State on this "formula" they conclude that this State is a police State, a burocratic State, a new form of slave State, and the like.

What is the *class* content of the formula, the Dictatorship over the Proletariat? In a bourgeois State there is a disguised or naked dictatorship over the proletariat, and indeed over the peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie and even over a large portion of the bourgeoisie. And in Russia Stalin is a dictator not only over the proletariat but also over the peasantry and over the burocracy, even over Molotov, Vishinsky and over the "Soviet" marshals. But this fact does not explain the *class* nature of the Russian Bolshevik State. Alexander the Great was a dictator over all the inhabitants of the Macedonian Empire; Peter the Great over the boyars, the serfs, over the artisans, shopkeepers and the infant working class; Napoleon over the dispossessed nobility, over the bourgeoisie, the peasantry and over the city proletariat. But how do we determine that the *class* nature of the State ruled by Alexander was *chattel slave,* of Peter's empire, *Feudal,* of Napoleon's, *bourgeois?* Certainly not by the *form* of the rule but by the *economic basis* on which the rule rested. By itself the form of rule tells us nothing about its *class* character unless we examine the *property foundation* under that rule. The accepted chronological line of demarkation between Feudal France and France as a bourgeois State is the Fall of the Bastille, July 14, 1789. Since that date France has witnessed a colorful procession of political forms. At first there was the rule of the minority of the big bourgeoisie, though Louis XVI was still the head of the State. Then came the Republic and the Jacobin dictatorship of Robespierre. Next followed the Thermidor, the Directory and the personal dictatorship of Napoleon, who was at first named Consul, later Emperor. On the heels of the fall of Napoleon there was the restoration of the House of Bourbon, the return of Napoleon, again the Bourbons, the July 1830 Monarchy, the Second Republic, the Second Empire, the Commune, the Third Republic, Vichy, the Fourth Republic—all regimes of the *bourgeois* State of France because they based themselves on private *capitalist* economy.

For Russia, the generally accepted line of demarkation between the *Feudal* and the bourgeois forms of State is March 3, 1861, the date of official abolition of serfdom signalizing the victory of the capitalist form of economy. Between *bourgeois* and Bolshevik States the dividing line is the October Revolution. It was not the theft of State power by the leadership of the proletariat on November 7, 1917 that deter-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

mined the *class* character of the new State in Russia but the nature of the *economy* established after the overthrow of capitalism, a new economy upon which this usurping minority based itself from the outset. The Marxist State is corrupt, oppressive and rapacious but in its *class* essence it is proletarian, operated through a privileged section of the Russian working class.

In Capitalism no regime, whether it ousts its predecessors violently or by peaceful means, comes into conflict with the capitalist economic foundation. It is evident that all regimes of the same *class character* conform to the identical class economy. By the same token, the removal of the Stalin burocrats from power by the workers and the institution of a democratic proletarian political system perpetuates the non-private or *State* form of economy—the only foundation upon which this system can function.

6. *The Kernel of Trotsky's "Permanent Revolution"—the Russian-nationalist Burocratic Workers State*

Following the 1936-38 Moscow Trials and the bloody phase of burocratic centralization of Stalin's power, the manufacture of fantasies and frauds concerning the class nature of the Bolshevik State reached unprecedented proportions. Equations with Hitler Germany became commonplace. And the hectic events in Europe gave rise to the illusion that the State burocracy, a feature, as we have seen, common to all minority class rules, was a new ruling class both in Russia and in Germany. In 1939 a former Trotskyist, Bruno R., published a book *La Bureaucratisation du Monde* in which this misleading idea was expanded to include the bourgeois democratic countries. According to this view, the Russian society was dominated by "burocratic collectivism," supposedly a new exploitive social class, while outside Russia, Capitalism was being abolished—not by the proletariat but by "burocratic collectivism" of the type of Roosevelt's New Deal.

Among confused workers this new delusion found wide acceptance because it was something of a relief to accept a seemingly true explanation for the anti-working class conditions which were not in harmony with the psychological connotations implied in the designation *Proletarian State.*

We have shown that Marx was a German nationalist, had dictatorial ambitions, was military-minded, and was anti-Semitic to the point of inciting pogroms against the Jews. The founder of the Nazi movement was a German nationalist, who sought from the outset of his political career the post of a military dictator and planned to exterminate the Jews. Was there then no difference between the two? A vast difference! Hitler was an agent of the bourgeoisie. Marx was an independent self-seeking burocrat at the head of the proletariat. Hitler came to the Prussian junkers, generals and German industrialists offering his services and was hired by them. The Prussian aristocracy came to Marx, yet although he often gave it political support

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

he refused to enter its employ. He wrote to Engels on April 24, 1867: "Yesterday Bismarck sent to me one of his satraps, the lawyer Warnebold (this is *between ourselves).* He would like 'to make use of me and my great talents for the good of the German people.' Von Bennigsen will pay his respects tomorrow." (XXIII, R. 404). Engels was not surprised: "I was thinking all along that Bismarck would knock on your door but I did not expect he would do it so soon." (Letter to Marx, April 27, 1867). We see that up to 1867 Bismarck did not knock, and when he did, nothing came of it because Marx remained independent and continued to live in exile. Hitler was placed in power by his masters represented by von Hindenburg to establish a German-nationalist, anti-Semitic, military dictatorship for the bourgeoisie. The economic basis for this dictatorship was bourgeois private ownership of industry and land. Therefore, Germany under Hitler was a capitalist State. Marx being his own master advanced the program "to wrest by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class . . . Abolition of property in land . . . abolition of all rights of inheritance." *(Communist Manifesto).* Could the bourgeoisie accept such a program? Never! What *class* State then would Germany have been under Marx's nationalistic, Left Christian anti-Semitic burocratic-military dictatorship? No other than a German burocratic proletarian State. What Marx did not mention in his program, just as Lenin omitted from his, was a seemingly unimportant detail that only a minority of the proletarian ruling class—the leadership—would wield power.

Since the surface characteristics and methodology of Marxism closely resemble many other reactionary movements, we have at our disposal no other means of determining the distinct *class* nature of this movement than by its actual programmatic position with respect to private bourgeois economy, and to the capitalist State. Marx often expressed admiration for capitalist development, gave indirect and on some occasions even direct support to Christianity and attacked the Jews. Why, then, was there such a wide gulf between Marx and Christian Socialism? Many surface features of both movements seem alike. The Stalin Marxists define Christian Socialism thus: "Christian Socialism, a name usually employed to denote a bourgeois reactionary teaching which attempts to reconcile the Socialist ideas with religious outlook and thereby to weaken the activity of the proletariat in its struggle against Capitalism . . . Recognizing the capitalist development as a 'blessing' the ideologists of Christian Socialism considered the usurers capital (particularly the Jewish) and especially Social Democracy (Marxism) as 'evils' " *(Gr. Sov. Enc.* LX, 127). The bourgeois definition of this movement leaves out the anti-Semitic aspect: *"Christian Socialism.* Any theory or system which aims to combine the teachings of Christ with the teachings of Socialism in their application to life." *(Webster's,* 478)

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Both the Marxist and the bourgeois definitions of Christian Socialism are false. Marxist Socialism, like Christian Socialism, combines Socialist ideas with anti-Semitism and the "teachings of Christ."

Yet neither Marx nor Lenin nor any other orthodox Marxist would fully combine with Christian Socialism because the two movements are separated by a *class* economy difference. The ultimate goal of officially Christian Socialism is to preserve bourgeois private economy; the ultimate goal of unofficially Christian Marxism is the elimination of bourgeois economy, the establishment of the State form of economy with a national burocratic hierarchy.

What then is the *class* difference between Marx's would be personal German dictatorship and Lenin's or Stalin's actual personal Russian dictatorship? None. Marx's *theoretically,* Lenin's and Stalin's *practically,* is based on the Statified form of property.

History disappointed Marx and Engels. They never lived to see their dream of a German Workers State fulfilled. However, this dream would have become a nightmare if they could have but known that their scheme would be applied in the country of their detested enemy, Bakunin! Marx and Engels imagined that the only road leading to the establishment of a National Workers State was through a vast industrial expansion which produced a large, well-organized proletariat. In their mechanical scheme of establishing no other but a *German* Workers State, they limited Russia to a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Not by the greatest stretch of imagination could Marx and Engels have visualized Russia, the dark, peasant country, becoming a "Socialist" State decades before the overthrow of the bourgeoisie in the classical capitalist country, England, or in traditionally-revolutionary France, or, above all, in "the most enlightened nation in the world," Germany. Because Marx expected no more than a *bourgeois* revolution east of Germany, he not only did not fear it but actually hoped for it as a spark for the Marxist revolution in his own country. Referring to the 1863 Polish Insurrection which, if victorious, would have spelled the doom of Tsarism, Marx wrote to Engels on February 13, 1863: "Let us hope that this time the lava flows from east to west and not the other way around, so that we may be spared the 'honour' of French initiative."

Once it is established that Marx's "Socialism" is not the science for the liberation of the proletariat and all the other oppressed, but is, instead, the burocratic manipulation of a number of correct ideas as a screen for establishing a National Workers State, it is not difficult to understand what eventually occurred in Russia. Lenin took over the blueprint Marx and Engels had drawn up for Germany and themselves and applied it to Russia. To do this Lenin had to abandon the authentic Marxist theoretical "teaching" which limited the social struggle in Russia to a bourgeois-democratic revolution. He did so by adopting Trotsky's position of Permanent Revolution.

At this point it is necessary to subject to a concrete analysis the

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

political kernel of Trotsky's position. Trotsky presented his theory not as a prognosis of the *world* revolution but as a theoretical blueprint for the seizure of power by the *Russian* Marxists. The plan was addressed basically to Russian Social Democracy, and since he was dealing with Russia, Trotsky never submitted his theory for scrutiny to the Congresses of the Second International; he probably realized that they stood on Marx's position unreservedly. The real brilliance of Trotsky's theory was his daring reversal of the entire Marxist outlook on the question of whether advanced or backward countries could undergo a proletarian revolution first. Marx, a German nationalist, held tenaciously to the proposition that the "proletariat," that is the Marxist leadership, would first come to power in advanced countries, specifically Germany. International Social Democracy dogmatically accepted this. But Trotsky, a Russian nationalist, iconoclastically conceived of transferring Marx's program for a National Workers State to relatively backward Russia. Therefore he rejected Marx's proposition by inserting into his own theory of Permanent Revolution this thinly-veiled *Russian* theses: "In an economically backward country the proletariat can come to power sooner than in the economically advanced countries. . . . The conception of some sort of automatic dependence of the proletarian dictatorship upon the technical forces and resources of a country constitutes an extremely oversimplified 'economic' materialism." *(Perspectives of Rus. Rev.* R. 36; also, in *Perm. Rev.* by Trotsky, 30). The center of Marx's world was Germany; but the center of Trotsky's universe was *Russia.* He spoke of a "prolonged Socialist dictatorship" not of the world proletariat but of the *Russian* working class—a purely nationalist concept: "But how far can the socialist policy of the working class go in the industrial conditions of Russia? Only one thing can be said with certainty. It will run into political obstacles long before it comes up against the technical backwardness of the country. Without direct state support from the European proletariat the working class of Russia cannot remain in power and cannot convert its temporary rule into a prolonged socialist dictatorship." *(Perspectives,* 84; cited by Trotsky from his 1905 article *"Summaries and Perspectives"* in *H. of R. R.* III, 426). In actual life this formula of support to the Russian Workers State by proletarian State power in the rest of Europe never materialized and could not have materialized.

When the Bolsheviks seized power Lenin and Trotsky understood that this formula was fraught with great dangers to their personal-national burocratic interests. The formula "State support from the European proletariat" meant that European Marxists, specifically the German burocrats, would have had control of at least one highly-developed industrial country. Under such circumstances German "Socialism" would have become concretized in life, and with Russia a relatively backward country, its Marxist burocracy would have become a mere appendage to the Marxist burocracy of advanced Germany. Trotsky, therefore, quietly abandoned this part of his Permanent

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Revolution in the very first hours of the Bolshevik power and, together with Lenin, proceeded to solve a two-fold problem: to maintain the Russian Marxist dictatorship against bourgeois and proletarian assaults, and to prevent the rise of a Marxist dictatorship in Germany. They solved it by the policy of "peace" with the German bourgeoisie which had to tolerate a Marxist dictatorship in Russia. Later the Allied bourgeoisie followed the German example.

Trotsky's Permanent Revolution in action turned out to be the Russian Marxist decapitation of the World Revolution. The fear which Marx and Engels harbored for decades that France might emerge as The National Workers State instead of Germany, was inherited by Lenin and Trotsky with respect not only to France but to all of industrially developed Europe and America. While Marx and Engels expressed this fear in private correspondence and by betraying the Paris proletariat in 1871 to safeguard the possibility for their future burocratic power in a German Workers State, Lenin and Trotsky, and later Stalin, expressed it by betraying the world revolution to maintain their burocratic power in Russia. Trotsky's Permanent Revolution was remodeled on the night the Sovnarkom usurped power to enable the Russian Workers State to stand for decades without the supposedly indispensable "State support of the European proletariat." Only when Stalin was able to establish a military control over a number of non-Russian Marxist countries did this "support" materialize in the form of forcible robbery for the benefit of Russian "Socialism."

It is true that up to 1924 none of the Bolsheviks explicitly presented the theory that it was possible to build Socialism in one country alone. However, this fraud was implicit in the propaganda of the Lenin and Trotsky regime. Lenin came closest to expressing it in his article "On Cooperation" dictated at the time he completed his Testament. Trotsky, pretending to fight the "theory" of Socialism in one country, asserts that "either Lenin slipped in his dictation or that the stenographer made a mistake in transcribing her notes." (*Third Int. After Lenin,* 31). But Lenin's policies since October were quite consistent with his dictation. He made no slips when in a different work he advanced his nationalist view that Russia possessed all that was necessary to construct a complete Socialist society. (*S. W.* IX, 403). Only under the cover of this fraud could he hope to maintain and strengthen his personal dictatorship. Lenin covered up the "Socialism in one country" deceit by pretending that he was about to perform a "cultural revolution" which would lead Russia to his supposed goal: "This cultural revolution would be sufficient to transform us into a completely Socialist country." (409)

Marx's "Socialism" was composed of two distinct parts: 1) *the maximum program,* which embodied the concept of the German National Workers State. This program was to be carried out in a moment of extreme social and political world crisis through the removal of the German bourgeoisie from power and the formation of a Marxist

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

dictatorship in Germany. A ring of satellite nations was to be included in this plan. It is this element in Marxism that has been presented as the program supposedly for the liberation of all the oppressed; 2) *the minimum program,* which represented the everyday policy of maintaining the capitalist system in the world at large and temporarily in Germany itself through the so-called "lesser of two evils" choice—the open support to "progressive" bourgeois politicians and regimes as against patently reactionary ones. This part of Marx's "Scientific Socialism" has been explained away with the argument that the workers were thereby facilitating their struggle for Socialism. Since the decisive world-wide crisis did not occur in Marx's and Engels' time, their political activity was confined to the minimum program of support to Capitalism.

German Social Democracy, the direct heir to Marx's "Socialism," expressed its intention to fulfill the maximum program at some future date. However, as the material interests of the upper strata of German Social Democracy, unlike the material interests of Marx, became more and more dependent upon and identical with those of the German bourgeoisie, the maximum program became a mere pretense. As early as 1879 the leadership had reached a point where its spokesman, Wilhelm Liebknecht, indicated in the Reichstag on March 17, that German Social Democracy did not aim to overthrow the capitalist system or even the Kaiser regime: "Our party is indeed a party of reform in the strictest sense of the word and not a party aiming at violent revolution, which would be sheer nonsense. . . . I deny most emphatically that our efforts 'are directed' towards the overthrow of the 'existing state and social order.' " (Cited in Marx, *S. W.* II, 626)

The implication was clear enough: German Social democracy was solidly anchored to the bourgeois State and stood only on Marx's minimum program. Marx and Engels criticized Liebknecht, and on many other occasions reminded the German leadership of the maximum program. Quite in vain, as history proved. The logical moment, when the German Workers State could have been established came in 1917 after the overthrow of the Tsar. The situation was ideal for carrying out Marx's maximum program, for, in accord with Engels' prognosis, one of the first conditions for the formation of the National Workers State in Germany had materialized: "No revolution in Western Europe can finally conquer as long as the present Russian state exists beside it. Germany, however, is its next-door neighbor, hence Germany is the first to receive the shock of the Russian armies of reaction. The overthrow of Russian Tsardom, the dissolution of the Russian empire, is consequently one of the first conditions for the final victory of the German proletariat." ("On Social Conditions in Russia," *S. W.* II, 671)

German Social Democracy, far more than the Bolshevik Party before the arrival of Lenin in April 1917, required an ideological rearming. Had Marx and Engels lived, or Engels alone, the concept of

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

the German Workers State might have become a reality. In 1917, following the overthrow of the Tsar, the Russian soldiers, fraternizing with the German soldiers, and the Russian masses in the towns and villages, would have hailed the establishment of the German Workers State with enthusiasm. On the Western Front in those months war was at a standstill and the French and British soldiers, sick of the butchery, would undoubtedly have mutinied at the first order to suppress the German Workers State. But there was no Marx or Engels; and the German Social Democracy remained firmly attached to the bankrupt German bourgeoisie. Even the extreme Left Social Democratic group formed during the War by Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring, remained linked to the German bourgeois State. This group called for the fulfillment of the Marx-Lassalle bourgeois-democratic program of 1848, for the establishment of the Great-German capitalist republic (*Junius* pamphlet, 108; cited by Lenin and Zinoviev in *Against the Current,* R. 436). After the formation of the Bolshevik State and the fall of the German Empire this German Marxist group became an appendage to the Lenin-Trotsky power.

Thus, it was the unbreakable tie of all German Social Democracy to the German bourgeois State that caused Marx's maximum program, his cherished dream of establishing the "dictatorship of the proletariat" in Germany, to go up in smoke.

However, there *was* in the international Marxist movement one political leader who for years tenaciously held to the theses that "In an economically backward country, the proletariat can come to power sooner than in the economically advanced countries." This leader was Trotsky. All that was now required was that an organized force in relatively backward Russia accept this reversal of Marx's subjective conclusion. Lenin, heading a political organization, adopted the idea in the nick of time. He detached the Bolshevik Party from the bourgeois State and armed it with Trotsky's position. The Mensheviks, who adhered to Marx's line of limiting the Russian development to the bourgeois stage, lamented that according to Marx, the "Socialist revolution" had to be carried out in advanced countries first. Lenin went right ahead with his new position and rode to power. At the Third Congress of Soviets, in January 1918, using "revolutionary-Socialist" words to cloak his burocratic Russian-nationalist dictatorship Lenin remarked: "Things have turned out differently from what Marx and Engels expected. History has given us, the Russian toiling and exploited classes, the honorable role of vanguard of the international socialist revolution." (*S. W.* VII, 282)

7. *The Meaning of the Term "Workers State"*

The rightful owner of the State economy in Russia is, historically, the working class. To a slight degree the awareness of this has been reflected in some of the glib, albeit hollow declamations of the Bol-

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

shevik leadership. In every-day life, however, the ownership of the State and of State economy resides in the hands of a usurper. In Lenin's and Trotsky's day and in the period of the Trio-Trotsky bloc the stolen power and State property were in the illegal possession of an extremely narrow circle of persons who had wills of their own and a measure of freedom of criticism of Lenin's, Trotsky's and Stalin's acts. After the Fifteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party (Dec. 1927) Stalin, nominally propertyless, rapidly became the supreme unquestioned boss of the entire USSR and under his iron despotism, the true though unofficial ownership has been vested in his person alone and is limited only by territorial borders. If Louis XIV, autocrat of Feudal France, could declare, and with reason, "I am the State," Stalin has far more basis for repeating the boast. For though Louis XIV owned the royal manufactures of the State, he did not own the land of his aristocratic subjects nor the shops of the French bourgeoisie and artisans. Similarly, Napoleon at the crest of his dictatorial power (1810) owned the State and disposed at will of the State property of France, but not of the private property of the French bourgeoisie and not of the land secured by the peasantry. Stalin is the factual but not the legal owner of all the economy of the Bolshevik State.

Despite this complete centralization of the usurper's power and the fact that the masses are oppressed by his burocracy, the correct term for the Bolshevik State is National-Burocratic Christian Workers State or—which is the same thing—a Marxist State. The term "Workers" must be understood not in the possessive sense, as it is presented by the Stalin and Trotsky theoreticians, but in its adjectival sense, denoting the *class* character of the economic structure and therefore of the State superstructure. The identification of the expression "Workers State" with the concept that it must be headed by a *revolutionary* proletarian regime is erroneous. A capitalist State, France as an example, can be directed by a Left bourgeois regime, such as the Jacobin Republic, or the Commune; it can have a Rightist regime on what is in the immediate epoch a progressive form of economy, as was the case with Napoleon; it can have a Fascist superstructure like the Vichy government—but in all these instances it was a capitalist State.

8. *A Freak State Example*

The Marxist State in a certain sense appears to be a freak State. History knows of such a phenomenon as a freak State. It was the Confederate States of America born on February 4, 1861. Here was the most amazing social, political and economic combination in history. It was in a sense of the same class character as the Ancient slave States because it was based on chattel slavery, but the bondage in the Confederate States of America was confined to a specific race, was set in advanced capitalist surroundings utilizing agricultural machinery, railroads, steamships, telegraph, printing presses, modern textile and

Digitized by Google Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

munition factories and an Army equipped with rifles and artillery which technically were of a higher type than Napoleon's. It was not a capitalist State and yet it was not the *historical* form of chattel slave State. It was a freak, an offspring of capitalist development in Europe and the Northern States. Only Capitalism could have produced Eli Whitney's cotton gin (1793) and the large-scale manufacture of textiles which demanded an increased cotton output. It was actually capitalist development, therefore, which transformed the entire economic position of the South and laid the basis for the existence of this freak State. The germ of this State, Negro slavery, was present in the United States when the country emerged from the original thirteen British colonies. In the last years before the Civil War the country was really two antagonistic States held together by an extremely frail tie.

Chiefly what made the slaveholders' State unique or freakish was the fact that it was a product of young Capitalism, was a political and economic retrogression from Capitalism, and eventually an obstacle to the further development of Capitalism. Thus we see that a freak State is not confined to the realm of theoretical possibilities but is a historical actuality. However, we must stress the very real differences in our "analogy." The ruling group of slaveholders did not create a historically important and world-encompassing ideology. They did not think of spreading their power internationally, nor of extending chattel slavery beyond the territory that would yield to cotton growing.

The Marxist State, emerging on the crest of the proletarian struggle for liberation, though representing an economic advance over Capitalism, is a retrogression from the basic goal of this struggle. Marxism entered upon the stage of history and misdirected the proletariat toward creating and maintaining a proletarian national-burocratic State, not toward setting up the *World Democratic Workers State*. The Bolshevik State, therefore, is a deformity, a "freak," due to the national and group divisions within the proletariat, not the normal and logical outcome of the struggle between the international bourgeoisie and the world proletariat. It is the materialization of a specific political system of deception and betrayal which has infested the proletariat since 1846-8, just as the Zionist State is not the concluding phase in the existence of the Jewish Scapegoat but is the product of a brand of bourgeois adventurism within the Jewish group. The temporary rise of both the Marxist and the Zionist States was facilitated by the complex political conditions in which the bourgeoisie and the proletariat found themselves. Unless the Socialist-minded workers and honest bourgeois elements organize and in time lead the masses of the world against Marxism and Capitalism, the Zionist State is to become a bloody trap for the Jews and the Bolshevik State an indirect cause of military-anti-Semitic world-wide terror conducted either by triumphant Bolshevism or victorious Capitalism.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

9. *The Tito State—A Rebel Satellite in the Marxist System of Burocratic Centralism*

Neither Marx, Lenin nor later Stalin ever confined his program of power to the original national base. Marx planned to surround Germany with satellite countries. Lenin, after a precarious start, extended Russian Marxist rule to the Ukraine, Georgia and other countries and made attempts to spread it to the Baltic, Poland, Iran, Rumania, Hungary. This policy was termed "the extension of October." Stalin has continued this policy. The mechanics of Marxist territorial expansion are to make the home base secure by centralization of the burocratic machinery and, simultaneously, to widen the territorial periphery. Only contiguous territories are added, not through a separate rising of the masses under the Comintern leadership, but through the direct or indirect backing of the Bolshevik armed forces. The Russian burocracy always guided its agencies abroad along the lines of preventing the establishment of another Marxist State geographically isolated from Moscow. The Russian burocrats have always feared the threat of decentralization of power or rivalry of another center, as well as the danger of the rise of a democratic proletarian movement. The Tito State, in this respect, is a long-feared development. It was created not through a "normal" struggle between the Russian Marxist burocracy and the bourgeoisie but was the outcome of an agreement between the Western imperialists and Stalin. "The Teheran conference in November, 1943, gave Russia a Western frontier as deep into Europe as it owned at its imperial zenith. It acknowledged Russian aspirations in regard to Finland and the Balkan States." *(Collier's,* June 22, 1946, 13). "The fact is that the British have reached a point where they are willing to see Rumania, Bulgaria and even Hungary and Yugoslavia brought within the Russian security system along with Czechoslovakia and Poland." *(N. Y. T.* Oct. 15, 1944)

With this agreement the Western imperialists factually recognized the Stalin-controlled Partisan leader, Tito. When Stalin's troops and Tito's Partisans drove the Nazis out of Yugoslavia, Tito was set up as the Kremlin's Yugoslav puppet. However, Stalin withdrew his Russian troops prematurely, and Tito, quite familiar with Moscow's pattern of centralization, the periodic removal and often physical destruction of leaders, saved his personal power and undoubtedly his neck by breaking away from Stalin's orbit. The Tito State is an isolated segment in the Marxist State system, set up on the Russian pattern. It is antagonistic to the bourgeoisie, to the Kremlin burocracy and to the proletariat, and, since no small State can exist independently for any lengthy period in this era of struggle between colossal powers, the Tito State is due to be overturned either by the bourgeoisie or by the Russian Marxist State, or by the world proletariat if it takes matters into its own hands in time and settles the fate of all three.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

10. *Summary on the Historical Essence of the Marxist Revolution*

In the *Communist Manifesto,* the founders of the Marxist movement, for demagogic reasons, pretended that their aim was the "overthrow of all existing social conditions." (*S. W.* I, 241). However, owing to its burocratic-nationalist, Christian, anti-Semitic and yet, at the same time, anti-bourgeois nature, the Marxist revolution could never advance beyond the policy of overthrowing only *one* condition in bourgeois society, the capitalist economy exclusively in the interests of the organized Marxist minority. When Zinoviev at a Bolshevik Party Congress admitted that the bourgeois apartments and featherbeds were seized not by the masses but by the "Communists," he presented in miniature the essence of the Marxist revolution. The Party burocracy took over the bourgeois industry, made it a basis for expanding production, and in order to safeguard its burocratic power and privileges has maintained and even reinforced all the other "existing social conditions" which previously safeguarded the privileged position of the Tsar and the bourgeoisie. Marxism has built a Church of its own, has made use of the Jewish Scapegoat, has established a Great Russian national supremacy with the resultant perpetuation of the oppression of "inferior" national groups. Above all, Marxism has created an uncrowned ruler of the State—Marxist Autocracy. This had not been clear to the entire "educated" world. An old, ignorant Russian peasant, a short while after the formation of the Sovnarkom dictatorship, came to Smolny and made this remark: "'In the old days we only talked about the Tsar, but they tell us now, *Tovarishchi,* tomorrow I can shake hands with Tsar Lenin himself. God grant him long life.' The audience exploded. Astounded at the roars of laughter and applause, the old peasant sat down." (Albert Rhys Williams, *Lenin,* 52). While the advanced elements among the masses were intoxicated with Lenin's demagogy that now the workers and peasants ruled Russia, the old peasant without knowing it, hit upon the fact that the Marxist revolution inevitably introduces a one-man rule, and that a one-man rule in any State and in any form, is autocratic. Napoleon's Constitution of May 18, 1804 did not proclaim the abolition of the Republic but combined the Republic with the Empire: "The government of the Republic is confided to an emperor who takes the title Emperor of the French." However, Napoleon for many years before this formality had actually been a monarch of bourgeois France. Caesar had been a monarch before he placed the term "imperator" at the head of his various titles. The popes, when they ruled the States of the Church, "Chancellor" Hitler, "Ataturk" Kemal, "Premier" or "Generalissimo" Stalin, or the "Chairman of the Soviet of People's Commissars, Comrade Lenin" represent, in historical reality, *monarchism in disguise*—without a royal headdress. This is a fact irrespective of the *class* State nature of the given monarchism—Ancient, Feudal, bourgeois or proletarian.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Because of its fundamentally anti-bourgeois nature in the basic form of economy, Marxism is in a very strategic position to generate a tremendous "liberation" demagogy based on the concrete substantiation of the abolition of capitalist economy in the Bolshevik State. This single anti-bourgeois feature blinds the Bolshevik workers to the fact that a revolution carried out by the Marxists is a *reactionary* revolution, that Marxism is the greatest pseudo-scientific swindle in history. It is this single anti-capitalist feature that facilitates for the Marxist leadership the perpetuation of the most monstrous crimes. Of all the criminal movements in the evolution of mankind, Marxism stands out as the only one which fully and unmistakably manifests keen consciousness of its own crimes.

To appear before the deluded masses as martyrs in the cause of abolishing all oppression, the Marxist oppressors have been reciting on every "revolutionary" occasion the long record of imprisonment, exile and sacrifice of life sustained by the Marxist movement. That many of those who paid this heavy toll were not aware of the criminal nature of Marxism goes without saying. The fact remains that those Marxist leaders who secured power have been waving the "sacrifice" banner as a tactic to win greater confidence among the masses. The Marxists have obscured the fact, however, that every group of enslavers and deceivers of the masses pays dearly for the privileged status it seeks to acquire, continuously contributing in blood when it achieves power, and pays dearly when it is overthrown. The early Christian hierarchy withstood terrible persecutions at the hands of the Roman masters before it won the position of State power and an enslaver of millions of people. The Feudal nobility went through a period of hounding oppression before it became the preeminent oppressor itself, and then it nearly exterminated itself in the wars for the distribution of the Feudal privileges. The American slaveholders paid a very heavy price in life and lost almost their entire property in an effort to salvage their obsolete system of exploitation. The international bourgeoisie sacrificed much of its blood, with many Left bourgeois idealists going to the gallows, to the execution block and the guillotine in the historical struggle which made the bourgeois form of slavery dominant. In the same manner the Marxists have made their payment in blood and suffering to secure the birth and growth of their own system of enslavement and tyranny. And following in the footsteps of other exploiting and oppressing minorities of mankind, the minority in control of the Marxist State is prepared to make untold sacrifices in the struggle which may spell the death of this State or its emergence as the sole and supreme power on earth. If the War of American Independence was a struggle between the British and the American exploiters; the wars between Feudal Europe and the Robespierre and later the Napoleon regimes were expressions of the contest between two forms of exploitation of the masses; the Civil War between the Confederate and Federal forces was a military contest be-

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

tween chattel and wage slavery, then the Civil War between the Russian White Guards and the Bolsheviks was a conflict between the capitalist and the Marxist systems of exploitation and oppression. The fact that the international bourgeoisie intervened in that War on the side of the White Guards, and the fact that the Bolshevik State built a large international organization, simply testify to the implacable rivalry between Capitalism and Marxism, a historical life and death conflict between these two forms of slavery, each striving for complete mastery over the globe.

CHAPTER III.

DEMOCRATIC WORKERS WORLD STATE—TRANSITION TO THE CLASSLESS, NON-NATIONAL SOCIETY

1. *Reconstruction of Mankind's Ideology*

BOTH MARXIST and bourgeois ideologies are polluted ideologies. Each is a mixture of correct and false ideas. On peril of elimination by the oppressed, the Marxist burocracy and the bourgeoisie maintain their respective systems of ideology, mixing the correct concepts with fallacies or employing them for deliberate deceptions. The economic powers of mankind have reached unprecedented heights but in the misguiding hands of the Marxists and the bourgeoisie they are threatening the destruction of mankind itself. The peril has the "merit" of forcing upon mankind the awareness of the necessity of eliminating the Marxist and capitalist structures and of organizing the productive forces upon a higher social plane. But the liberation of the masses of mankind from the Marxist and capitalist suffocation must commence with the crystallization of an entirely new ideology. Each thought must be analyzed and the truths abstracted from the falsehoods. One malpractice in particular which is to be discarded is the organization of systems of thought around "great names" and the surrounding of these names with a religious halo. This as a rule stultifies independent thinking because under the banner of a "great name" an entire system of thought is automatically passed on from generation to generation.

History gives ample evidence of the fallacy of accepting or rejecting in toto any person's ideas or the glorification of any individual. Marx was a political charlatan, a German-nationalist "proletarian" Left Christian, a pogrom-monger and for many years a supporter of Negro slavery, but his works contain many formulations which are scientifically accurate and are of value to mankind. These correct ideas must be abstracted from the fraudulent mass of his writings which should be rejected together with the deification of the man himself. Not every reactionary ideology is completely devoid of correct ideas.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Many bourgeois and Marxist scientists hold naive political views, but their achievements in science have immense intrinsic value for mankind. Church art is superstitious and anti-Semitic in content, but by separating the form and the technique from the overt or covert content we can distinguish the positive features of this art.

2. *The Democratic Workers World State vs. the Marxist and Bourgeois States*

For thousands of years the toiling masses and oppressed nations have hoped for a united, happy mankind living in peace and material well being. The delusion would always arise, at every great historical turn, that in the new era this ideal would be concretized. So it was in the period of the French Revolution which, instead, ushered in a phase of capitalist wars and exploitation. The ensuing disillusionment brought widespread apathy and the conviction that the ideal was impossible of achievement. But the apathy did not last long. The pressure of the evils of Capitalism revived the urge for the establishment of an ideal society. The highest point in this aspiration was the Bolshevik Revolution. The triumph of the Marxist burocracy in Russia induced in millions the entrapping belief that at last mankind arrived within reach of the desired goal.

In a comparatively short time, however, disillusionment set in among many sections of the working class and among other class elements sympathetic to the Bolshevik Revolution. There developed a constant stream of people being lured into the Bolshevik camp and an uninterrupted exodus of the disappointed and embittered.

With the atomic era and the spread of the ideological influence of the Bolshevik burocrats, their professed goal of bringing the whole globe under their control has taken on a threateningly tangible form, while, on the other hand, the agony of bourgeois private economy has led the international bourgeoisie to a desperate pass of seeking to overpower the Bolshevik State by the sheer weight of a military force. The intensification of the general social crisis has caused the crystallization of a sentiment among the alarmed elements supporting the bourgeois system for the realization of the old dream of establishing a united humanity on peril of total extermination of mankind. Subjectively, some of these elements counterpose their view to both the Bolshevik and the bourgeois multi-State systems. However, despite their lyrical utterances, their objective is the establishment of a *Christian,* bourgeois world government. "Humanity is now divided into nations, each working for its own self-interests. In the new era, people, instead of thinking in nationalistic terms, will think in terms of humanity. They will consider one another as brothers and will cooperate with each other in every way . . . They will then practice Christ's commands . . ." *(United World,* July 1943, 9). "The greedy economic systems of the past are obsolete . . . The 'share-the-wealth'

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

spirit is growing by leaps and bounds in this and every other country of the world . . . to develop quickly in men, women and children the spiritual and moral nature . . . it could be accomplished easily if the Christian organizations of the world would unite in the movement. Jesus promised . . ." (C. Fillmore, "Economic World Unity," *United World,* Jan. 1944, 2, 4). The avowed goal of these tendencies is a "Christian World Order" *(World Government News,* April 1949, 15)

One of the politico-economic "Christ's commands" is "servants obey your masters." This thesis presupposes the existence of masters and servants, exploiters and exploited. The thesis reflects the social reality of Christendom, a concrete "ideal" of Christianity. And since no Church can eliminate this thesis from the *New Testament* without exploding the whole story about Christ, just as no tendency of Judaism can wipe out the tradition of enslavement of man by man from the *Old Testament* without disrupting the whole Bible, the only kind of a Christian world that can be is a world divided into masters and servants.

The movements for the "Christian World Order" do not admit that it is impossible to establish a "share-the-wealth" society upon an economic system where the largest portion of the economy, the basic means of livelihood—land, mines, industry, transportation, communication and distribution—is the private property of a small section of the population while the overwhelming majority must hire itself out to these owners. The proponents of the "Christian World Order" do not state that the universal brotherhood of mankind can be achieved only on the basis of brotherhood in the possession and democratic management of the productive forces of the entire world.

While in the bourgeois camp some ideologists seek a way out of the frightful pass by inventing new forms of capitalist rule and oppression, in the proletarian camp ideologists strive to cast off Marxism and discover the true path toward abolition of all oppression, capitalist and Marxist.

In the conflict between the capitalist and Marxist orders, the bourgeoisie, though subjectively violently antagonistic to the Bolshevik burocrats, nevertheless objectively aids them because its propaganda is guided not by a policy of exposing their true role within the proletariat and showing the workers, the peasants and all the other oppressed elements the path to liberation but by a policy of maintaining the deadly division of mankind into rich and poor, private owners of economy and exploited masses, of continuing the social and economic supremacy of the White over the Negro, of perpetuating the Scapegoat condition of the Jew. The international bourgeoisie, by shouting about the Bolshevik oppression and meantime denying the oppression by its own system tends leave to the Bolsheviks, Russian and domestic, an unobstructed field for demagogic attacks on capitalist wage slavery and thus objectively aids them in their work to secure hold on the mind of the world proletarian masses. The cases of France, Italy and

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

China, where the Stalin burocrats won the masses not through application of terror but by means of "revolutionary" demagogy, are telling examples.

Does the Marxist State represent a historically new social and economic system of exploitation of the toiling masses and of national oppression? Is its economic base of a higher historical order than Capitalism? Can the Marxist system displace the capitalist system over the entire globe?

The Marxist system of exploitation on the basis of State economy has no precedent; therefore, it is a new social form of enslavement of man by man. Statified economy through the most spectacular tempo of expansion of industry on record, the application of planning on a gigantic scale and the striking effectiveness in war proved itself to be superior to private capitalist economy. Even the capitalist countries have been pressed in time of severe economic crises or great military strain to take a bow in the direction of the superior State economic form through government regulations of many private enterprises. The Statified form of economy, while it is the highest hitherto existing form, and is the only possible *economic* form under which the masses can liberate themselves, can also serve as a means of exploitation of the masses by a small usurping, privileged section of the proletariat. This unforeseen concrete result makes the Marxist theoretical proposition of merely abolition of classes a narrow and dangerous formula and poses the necessity of abolition not only of classes but of the *division within classes,* specifically within the proletariat.

The bourgeoisie, due to its inability to counteract the Bolshevik demagogic appeal to the masses, to the Negroes, to the Jews and other oppressed elements, has no other recourse than suppression of its own bourgeois-democratic conditions which ordinarily allow a considerable lattitude of critical opposition to its rule. And this is a great weakness of the bourgeoisie. In the conflict with the new rival system of exploitation, unlike in its old struggle against Feudal aristocracy, the bourgeoisie relies exclusively on force of arms. And this is another great weakness of the bourgeoisie. These two weaknesses in the event of a prolonged armed conflict may lead to the disintegration of the armies of the bourgeoisie, their ideological capture by the Marxists, probably first by the Social Democrats and then by the Bolsheviks, and the definitive military victory of the Bolshevik State.

Because the international bourgeoisie furnishes ideological objective aid to the Marxist enslavers of the masses within the Bolshevik State, and, in addition, hounds their agents and followers in the capitalist world, and, more than all else, due to the fact that the Bolshevik exploiting system rests on a higher economic foundation than the bourgeois exploiting system, the temporary displacing of Capitalism on a global scale by the Leninist-Marxist system is within the realm of possibilities. The full strength of the magnetic attraction of Leninist-Marxist demagogy has not yet been fathomed. In 1917 Lenin's political

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

arsenal was confined to Marx's maximum-program generalizations which he successfully manipulated against the Russian bourgeoisie and its Menshevik supporters who would not venture beyond Marx's minimum program. But since then Leninism-Marxism has enriched its arsenal of political demagogy with the proof that it can and does actually overthrow capitalist exploiters. This undeniable fact has had an irresistible effect on hundreds of millions of workers and peasants whose condition, as in the case of the Negroes in the Nineteenth Century, has been changed by Bolshevism from one form of economic and social enslavement to another, to be sure, to a "higher" one.

Prior to this investigation the enslaving character of Marxism was never even suspected among the politically advanced workers, nor the simple fact that Marxism as a whole is a structure built primarily on lies. However, the burocrats of the different branches of Marxism often correctly pointed out the deceptive nature of one another. Thus, Trotsky several years before he became a Leninist, expressed this view about Leninism: "The whole construction of Leninism is at present built up on lies and contains the poisonous germs of its own disintegration." (Letter to Cheidse, Feb. 25, 1913. Cited by Stalin at the Plenary Meeting of the Communist Fraction of the Trade Unions, Nov. 19, 1924. *Leninism or Trotskyism,* by Zinoviev, Stalin, Kamenev, 41). The truth in this observation of Trotsky's is extremely circumscribed politically and in the matter of time. In reality, as records establish, Leninism, as well as Trotskyism, as well as Menshevism, are but Russian branches of the general international Marxist movement which, *in all periods of its history,* represents a system of political lies and crimes against the oppressed and exploited and carries within itself, concealed by a scientific cover, not merely germs but monstrous diseases which may spell either the doom of both Marxism and Capitalism—if Marxism maintains itself—or the doom of mankind.

Unless the Marxist spell over the advanced workers, peasants, the petty-bourgeoisie, Negroes, Jews and other oppressed sectors of mankind is broken, the life and death struggle between the Bolshevik and the capitalist States is a foregone conclusion. This conflict entails the threat not only of widespread devastation, appalling bloodshed and general unprecedented suffering but of destruction of mankind itself.

As against the Bolshevik and the Capitalist systems of enslavement, the one disguised as "People's Democracies" and "Land of Victorious Socialism," the other disguised as "Free Nations" and "Free Enterprise," the one run in the narrow interests of a powerful privileged minority of the working class, the other in the narrow interests of a powerful privileged minority of the capitalist class, there emerges the imperative requirement, as the only means for the survival of mankind, to establish a true democratic cooperative world commonwealth which excludes racial, national, class and group divisions and conflicts of mankind. The cooperative social system, resting on a world-coordinated economy and operating through the Democratic

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Workers World State, vaguely envisaged for decades as "Socialism," is the only form which eliminates the multi-State system inevitable in a society based on minority group economic and social advantages.

Mankind can be set upon the path towards this goal only through the ideological and organizational liberation of the proletarian vanguard from the talons of Marxism and the crystallization of a World Proletarian-Democratic Party. The road to the vast masses and to the honest, subjectively anti-capitalist and anti-Marxist bourgeois elements is through the proletarian vanguard.

Under the Democratic Workers World State mankind, its hands unshackled and mind free of superstition, will advance toward the stage of non-class organization of economy and social life, and will arrive at physical and mental health and maturity. Science, which in the Marxist and capitalist States cannot escape being harnessed to national class-group interests, will be released and employed exclusively to the benefit of humanity. Mankind will attain superabundance of the fruits of its labors, will plan its own history, will gradually gain mastery over the globe, its home, and to the extent of the expansion of scientific achievement, will move forward towards its truly great goal—the conquest of the knowledge of the universe.

Digitized by Google
Original from UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

14 DAY USE
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED
LOAN DEPT.
RENEWALS ONLY—TEL. NO. 642-3405
This book is due on the last date stamped below, or
on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

REC'D LD MAR 19 '71-2 PM 76

MAY 29 1971

REC'D LD JUN 6 71-2 PM 12

LD21A-60m-3,'70
(N5382s10)476-A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
BERKELEY

RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the
NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS

- 2-month loans may be renewed by calling (510) 642-6753
- 1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books to NRLF
- Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days prior to due date.

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

SENT ON ILL

JAN 12 1999

U. C. BERKELEY

NOV 14 2001

NOV 27 2001

NOV 17 2003

12,000 (11/95)

Digitized by Google

Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Digitized by Google
Original from
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA